Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Boston Public Library

https://archive.org/details/unitedirishmenth04madd

THE
UNITED IRISHMEN
THEIR
LIVES AND TIMES

Arthur O'Connor

In the Uniform of a General of Division in the French Army. After a Portrait by Comeford, now in the National Gallery, Dublin

THE
UNITED IRISHMEN

THEIR LIVES AND TIMES

BY

RICHARD ROBERT MADDEN

M.D., F.R.C.S., M.R.I.A.

NEWLY EDITED

WITH NOTES, BIBLIOGRAPHY AND INDEX

BY

VINCENT FLEMING O'REILLY

NEW YORK
THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

56719 4

THE SHAMROCK EDITION

This edition is strictly limited to one thousand numbered sets, and is sold by subscription only.

Number 313

Copyright, 1916, by
THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

PAGE

Erin ix

Arthur O'Connor

Chap. I. Early Life 3

Chap. II. The "Press" and its Writers . 28

Chap. III. O'Connor's Trial 99

Chap. IV. Evidence of O'Connor . . . 118

Chap. V. O'Connor's Imprisonment . . . 148

Chap. VI. O'Connor's Last Work . . . 155

Lord Edward Fitzgerald

Chap. I. Early Career 172

Chap. II. Parliamentary Career . . . 191

Chap. III. Experiences in Paris 209

Chap. IV. Intimacy with O'Connor . . . 213

Chap. V. Trip to the Continent . . . 219

Chap. VI. Plans for Escape 241

Chap. VII. Capture of Lord Edward . . 263

ILLUSTRATIONS

Arthur O'Connor . . . . . *Frontispiece*
After a Painting by T. Comeford.

PAGE

Incident of the Rebellion in Wexford . . 2
From the Original Drawing by Geo. Cruikshank.

General Sarrazin 98
After a Painting by a French Artist.

Lord Edward Fitzgerald 172
After a Painting by W. Hamilton, R. A.

Capture of Lord Edward Fitzgerald . . . 262
From the Original Drawing by Geo. Cruikshank.

ERIN

WILLIAM DRENNAN

(Written in 1795)

Dr. William Drennan was born in Belfast, May 23, 1754, and in 1778, after he had taken his degree of M. D., he began practice in his native city. He was one of the organizers of the United Irishmen. In 1794 he was put on trial, in company with Archibald Hamilton Rowan, for issuing "an address of the United Irishmen to the Volunteers of Ireland." Rowan was fined and sentenced to imprisonment, but Drennan, who was the real author, was acquitted. He was one of the founders of the "Belfast Magazine." He published in 1815 "Fugitive Pieces," and in 1817 a translation of Sophocles' "Elektra." He died February 5, 1820. He was the first to address Ireland as "The Emerald Isle." Madden states that this poem first appeared in the organ of the United Irishmen, "The Press," but in that paper it was printed with the following fore note: "The following appears in the 'Express Packet'—a London Print. Why such a production should first appear in England, may appear extraordinary:—the fact is, that genius was discouraged, and the press in Ireland, acting in connivance with the Castle, strangled every child of promise in its birth."

When Erin first rose from the dark-swelling flood,
God bless'd the green island, and saw it was good;
The Em'rald of Europe, it sparkled, and shone,
In the ring of the world the most precious stone!

In her sun, in her soil, in her station, thrice blest,
With her back towards Britain, her face to the West,
Erin stands proudly insular on her steep shore,
And strikes her high harp midst the ocean's deep roar.

But when its soft notes seem to mourn and to weep,
The dark chain of silence is thrown o'er the deep;
At the thought of the past, the tears gush from her eyes,
And the pulse of the heart makes her white bosom rise:—

O! sons of great Erin! lament o'er the time
When religion was—war, and our country—a crime;
When men, in God's image, inverted His plan,
And moulded their God in the image of man.

When the int'rest of state wrought the general woe;
The stranger—a friend, and the native—a foe;
While the mother rejoic'd o'er her children opprest,
And clasp'd the invader more close to her breast.

When with *pale* for the body, and *pale* for the soul,
Church and state join'd in compact to conquer the whole;
And as Shannon was stained with Milesian blood,
Ey'd each other askance, and pronounced it was good!

By the groans that ascend from your forefathers' grave,
For their country thus left to the brute and the slave,
Drive the Demon of Bigotry home to his den,
And where Britain made brutes, now let Erin make men!

Let my sons, like the leaves of their shamrock, unite,
A partition of sects from one footstalk of right;
Give each his full share of the earth and the sky,
Nor fatten the slave where the serpent would die!

Alas, for poor Erin! that some still are seen,
Who would dye the grass red in their hatred to green!
Yet, oh! when you're up, and they down, let them live,—
Then yield them that mercy which they did not give.

Arm of Erin! be strong; but be gentle as brave,
And, uplifted to strike, still be ready to save;
Nor the feeling of vengeance presume to defile
The cause or the men of the Emerald Isle.

The cause it is good, and the men they are true;
And the green shall outlive both the orange and blue;
And the daughters of Erin her triumph shall share,
With their full-swelling chest and their fair-flowing hair.

Their bosoms heave high for the worthy and brave,
But no coward shall rest on that soft-swelling wave;
Men of Erin! awake, and make haste to be blest!
Rise, arch of the ocean! and Queen of the West!

THE
UNITED IRISHMEN
THEIR
LIVES AND TIMES

Incident of the Rebellion in Wexford

From the Original Drawing by George Cruikshank

George Cruikshank

MEMOIR OF ARTHUR O'CONNOR

CHAPTER I

EARLY LIFE

A MEMOIR of Arthur O'Connor deserves a prominent place in a work of this description, on account of the position in which he stood in the Leinster Directory of the United Irishmen, as the earliest and foremost member of the southern executive, and a member also of the Ulster executive. He is entitled to consideration, moreover, as a man of independent fortune, of considerable influence, no less from his connections than his brilliant talents, who had distinguished himself in parliament, in the press, at public meetings, and who moved in the first society both in England and in Ireland. Arthur O'Connor claimed, moreover, to be the descendant of an ancient race, and I feel it my duty to lay before my readers the best evidence that can be adduced in favour of that claim, though I am not able, or perhaps not sufficiently skilled in genealogical antiquarianism, to recognize the validity of that claim.

The sept of O'Connor Kerry, we are told by Dr. O'Donovan, were of very ancient and noble origin, being descended from the illustrious line

of Ir, son of Milidh, or Milesius, which sept is said to have reigned in Uldah, or Ulster, from the Milesian conquest to the subjection of that kingdom, and the destruction of the famous royal seat of Emania, A. D. 332, by the royal race of Heremon. Of this line of Ir, while it flourished at Emania, were the champions of the Red Branch, as celebrated in our old Celtic story and song, as the feats of the heroes of the Trojan war have been in Hellas or Greece, and the exploits of the Paladins of Charlemagne in the romances of the middle ages and the strains of Ariosto. From King Fergus, who reigned at Emania about the commencement of the Christian era, and the heroine Meave, Queen of Connacht, the old genealogists deduce Ciar, the progenitor of the line of O'Connor Kerry, whose chiefs were kings of Kerry for centuries previous to the Anglo-Norman invasion in the twelfth century. Soon after that invasion, says Dr. O'Donovan, the dominions of this family were narrowed to the territory of the Iraght-I-Conor. At the close of the reign of Elizabeth, they were deprived of the greater part of this little principality, and the lands which they had peopled for at least 1600 years, were conferred upon the then recently erected University of Dublin. Finally, in the confiscations under the Cromwellian usurpation, they shared the common ruin of most of our Milesian houses. Of this O'Connor Kerry

sept is "the celebrated Arthur Condorcet O'Connor, General of Division in France," writes Dr. O'Donovan, who, he adds, "is the son of Roger Conner, Esq., of Connerville, son of William Conner, Esq., Connerville, son of Mr. Daniel Conner, of Swithen's Alley, Temple Bar, London, merchant, and afterwards of Bandon, in the county of Cork, son of Mr. Cornelius Conner of Cork, whose will is dated 1719, son of Daniel Conner, who was the relative of O'Connor Kerry. This Cork branch descends from Philip Conner, merchant, of London, to whom his relative, John O'Conner Kerry, conveyed Asdee by deed, dated August, 1598." [1]

It is deserving of notice that the ancestors of Arthur O'Connor designated themselves simply Conner. Arthur and Roger were the first of their race who assumed the O of the ancient family of Ballengare, of an undoubted regal line, with which family the Conners of Connerville, I believe, were not legitimately connected.

The father of Arthur, old Roger Conner, inherited considerable property from one of his ancestors, who had certainly lived long and made a large fortune in England (if he was not a native of that country), and had been engaged in

[1] "O'Donovan's Book of Rights," p. 48; "Battle of Moyrath," pp. 172, 202, 215, 328, 329, 248; "Four Masters," vol. II., pp. 774, 775, 891, 893, 1109, 1111. To the eminent and accurate Irish historical antiquarian, John Cornelius O'Callaghan, Esq., the author is indebted for the preceding notice.

the business of a chandler in London. This old opulent tradesman came over or returned to Ireland, and fixed himself eventually in Bandon.[1] Whatever means came into the possession of old Roger, the father of Arthur (and they were ample), were derived from this person.

Old Roger married an Irish lady of high rank, the sister of Lord Longueville, a person of stronger intellectual powers than her husband. The parents of Arthur O'Connor were not very remarkable for their exalted virtues or strong religious principles, or particularly commendable for the moral or religious example they set their children. Old Roger Conner, of Connerville, by this marriage with Anne Longfield, sister of Lord Longueville, had issue:

1. Daniel, born in 1753, who came into possession of Connerville during his father's lifetime, "to his father's great misfortune." A *crim con* affair with the wife of a Mr. Gibbons, a prosecu-

[1] The first Conner of any note in the county Cork was a Mr. Daniel Conner, of Bandon, styled "merchant"—(See Sir Bernard Burke's "Landed Gentry," part i., page 232). This Daniel Conner is, no doubt, the person above mentioned, who had been, at one period of his life, engaged in business in London. He married, and had issue, besides daughters: 1. Daniel, who carried on mercantile business in Bandon, and died there in 1737. 2. William, who was a representative of the county Cork in 1765. He married a daughter of Roger Bernard, Esq., of Palace Anne, county Cork, in 1721, and had issue: Roger, who built the house called Connerville, and married Anne Longfield, sister of Lord Longueville, by whom he had issue, among others, the subject of this memoir.

tion and heavy damages, obliged Daniel to quit Ireland and to sell Connerville to his brother Roger. This Daniel went to Bristol, where he fixed his abode. He removed subsequently to Orme Square, Bayswater, near London, and died there June 4th, 1846, aged ninety-three years. He married the lady he ran away with, and had one child, a daughter, by the marriage. He married, secondly, the sister of his deceased wife, a Miss Hyde, sister of the Rev. A. Hyde, and had issue Daniel Conner, of Manch, near Connerville, born in 1798, who now resides there in the commission of the peace, and who had the misfortune, many years ago, to shoot, in a duel, the father of the present Mr. O'Neil Daunt.

2. William Conner had been a major of the Cork Militia, and held the lucrative office of Collector of Cork, the emoluments of which were about £5,000 a year. He sunk into abject poverty, and died about 1822 or 1823 in misery in Dublin, and, it is said, in confinement for debt. An acquaintance of this gentleman thus speaks of him:—"There was another of the O'Connors, who was a major in the army, and subsequently a collector in the Customs at Cork. Through mistake in his accounts he lost this situation; and when first I knew him he was in Dublin, prosecuting some claims he had upon the commissioners." [1]

[1] "London and Dublin Mag.," Feb., 1828.

3. Robert Longfield Conner, who inherited from his father about £1,500 a year, was captain of a corps of yeomanry, a violent partizan of the Orangemen of his locality. He endeavoured unsuccessfully to get his brother Roger hanged. He died at his place, Fort Robert, about nine miles from Bandon, leaving three daughters.[1]

4. Roger O'Connor, the fourth son of Roger Conner of Connerville, who claimed " by the law and usage of tanistry to be the chief of his race," and who styled himself *Kier-Reige;* born in 1762, died near Cork, in the parish of Ovens, in 1834, and by his express desire his remains were interred in the old family vault of the M'Carthys at Kilcrea, though wholly unconnected with the latter.

5. Arthur O'Connor, a leader of the society of United Irishmen, a general of division in the French service; born in 1763, died at Bignon in France in his ninetieth year in 1852.

There was one daughter, Anne, who had been in love with a Mr. M'Carthy, was opposed in her desire to marry that gentleman, and drowned herself in a well at Connerville, which is still known in the locality, to the country people, as Anne's well. There were two other daughters, who died in early life without issue.

[1] Under date, August 23, 1815, in Secret Correspondence, book I., page 217 (Lord Whitworth, viceroy), a record is found of a " pension to Edward O'Connor, and Mrs. Margaret O'Connor, of £200 a year for life."

The following outline of a biographical sketch is made from a document furnishing specific replies to a number of queries which had been addressed by the author in 1842, to General O'Connor; and the substance of the answers to these queries is given here in a consecutive form, without any comment or intermixture of other matter. It is hardly necessary to add, that the form in which the information appears in this communication is very different from that in which an unbroken narrative might be expected from a man whose abilities, in the way of composition as well as in conversation, are acknowledged to be of the very highest order.

Arthur O'Connor was born at Mitchels, near Bandon, on the 4th of July, 1763. His father lived at Connerville, in the county of Cork. He was a man of very large landed property; he passed his life and expended his income in the country. A. O'Connor's mother was the only sister of Lord Longueville, and a woman of considerable talents and acquirements. She died at Connerville in 1780, aged forty-eight. His father died at the same place at the age of seventy, and both were buried at Kinsale. Arthur O'Connor, at an early age, was placed at a public school at Lismore, and subsequently at one in Castle Lyons. He had a great taste for poetry when very young, but his parents and preceptors discouraged it. He entered Dublin College, as fellow-commoner, in 1779, under Mr. Day. He had four brothers and three sisters; the three sisters died unmarried. Arthur O'Con-

nor was the youngest son; he was called to the Irish bar in 1788, but did not practise. He was educated in the Protestant religion—in rigid Protestantism. In 1807 he married the only child of Condorcet; he had three sons, one of whom only is living.[1] He inherited £1,500 a year, paternal property.

He was devoted, from the period of his college life, to serious studies, but political economy was the favourite study of his life. His literary tastes were formed on the classical education he received. His habits were always temperate, and were so even while he lived in Ireland. He lived there, and in England also, in the first circles. It was his good fortune to make many friends, and never to lose any of them, even when differing from them in principle. He became a member of the society of United Irishmen in 1796, and he and Lord Edward Fitzgerald constituted the first Leinster Directory. He never took any oath. He had great confidence in the whole of the Northern Directory, though less in the steadiness of one still living than in that of some others. Dr. White was a light man. Of the Leinster Directory, he had implicit confidence in Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Bond, and Jackson. He never was in a directory with Emmet.

[The fact is, the Catholic members convinced the Protestant members that they held separate meetings unknown to the Protestants, and always voted together on every question, while the Protestant members never met separately, and always voted as men that were of no party. For the above reason, General

[1] This was written in 1842. The son above mentioned is no longer living.

O'Connor had much greater reliance on Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Jackson, and Bond, and on the Northern Directory, than on the Catholic members, who all wanted resolution to act. General O'Connor will be forced to give in his memoirs several melancholy examples of this fact; but it was in the upper Catholics (this was the case), not in the rank of the people, who were all brave.[1]]

The first directory of the United Irishmen was the Northern, there being no organization of the United Irish in the three provinces of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, until two years later. When the Northern Directory was organized, it consisted of the two Simmses, Neilson, Tennant, and two others, whose names he does not remember. During the time the affairs of the United Irish were governed by the Northern Directory and Lord Edward Fitzgerald and himself, all hope of obtaining Catholic emancipation and reform was utterly abandoned, and they then looked to separation.

It is true, Emmet insisted on inserting in the remonstrance which he, M'Neven, and A. O'Connor addressed to government, that if Catholic emancipation and reform had been conceded, we should have broken

[1] The above passage in brackets, in reference to the Catholic leaders, from motives of consideration for General O'Connor, and a feeling of reluctance to injure his reputation, I used, as I then believed, a sound discretion in omitting in the statement of O'Connor, in reply to my queries, published in the first edition of this work. But the unfortunate publication of O'Connor, entitled "Monopoly," which appeared six years later, imposes on me the necessity of laying before the public the passages above mentioned, and some others equally objectionable and reprehensible.—R. R. M.

off the French alliance. But Emmet knew nothing of this; for he was not even a United Irishman when the French alliance was formed.[1]

When O'Connor first applied to Emmet to be of the directory with Jackson and Bond, he declined it. It was not until O'Connor was confined in the Tower of Dublin that Emmet became one of the directory.

The first Southern Directory consisted only of Lord Edward Fitzgerald and O'Connor; the second, of Jackson, Bond, M'Neven, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and O'Connor.

It is an error to put Emmet in the directory with Bond and Jackson; he was not in it until long after. He objected to the views of the other leaders, and menaced the directory to denounce them to government if they carried into execution the resolution that was taken to begin the revolution. He (O'Connor) was, from early life, of republican principles, imbibed at the time of the American revolution. At no time of his life, neither before he spoke in the Irish House of Commons nor subsequently, has he varied from those principles. His uncle, Lord Longueville, knew perfectly well, when he gave him a seat in parliament in 1791 for the borough of Philipstown, what were his principles, and he (O'Connor) only accepted the seat on the condition of being entirely free.

It may be easily conceived that the debates of the Irish House of Commons could seldom interest an unflinching republican. Before the great Catholic question in 1795, he seldom spoke. However, in February,

[1] One of the many misstatements of O'Connor in relation to T. A. Emmet.

1792, he made a speech on the Indian question, grounded on the principles of political economy. That speech caused Pitt to offer his uncle, Lord Longueville, an immediate place of commissioner in the revenue, with a promise of the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer [for A. O'Connor]. This offer was refused by O'Connor.

He does not believe there was an efficient, or any directory, after the month of March, 1798.

When General O'Connor negotiated, in 1796, the treaty for the United Irish with the agent of the French Directory, of which General Hoche's expedition was the result, there never had been any other treaty before that with France. In 1796, he and Lord Edward had an interview with Hoche on the French frontiers, and subsequently negotiations were entered into with Buonaparte. Buonaparte had a true intention to invade England, and had an army of 20,000 men in readiness for it, when the intelligence of the new designs of Austria and Russia caused that intention to be given up.

He did not visit France in 1797 or 1798; he was then in prison. He was arrested in the beginning of 1797, and imprisoned in the Tower of Dublin six months,[1] and in the beginning of 1798 he was arrested at Margate, and was tried at Maidstone in May the same year. The only witness against him was one Lane, who had been his sub-sheriff for the county Cork.

Though there was not legal evidence to prove that the paper found in Quigley's coat pocket was Quig-

[1] A. O'Connor was liberated on bail, the 5th of August, 1797.

ley's, yet, the fact is, it was his, and was found in his riding coat; for when the five prisoners were brought to Bow Street, a report was spread that the papers taken on the prisoners were lost; for the first time, Quigley said it was fortunate the papers were lost, for that there was one in his pocket that would hang them all. He never made a secret to his fellow-prisoners that he got that paper from a London society. In my memoirs I will clear up this point.

Cox appeared at Maidstone, and came there from the interest he took in an event which involved the life of O'Connor. He remained always faithful to him, and also to Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Whatever changes may have taken place in his conduct, it was not until after Lord Edward's death and O'Connor's exile. While there was a chance of success, he was one of the staunchest men in Ireland to their cause.

It is a great error to confound the conduct of Cox during the time the Union lasted, with his conduct since it ceased. There was not a single man in the Union, south or north, be he who he may, that was more staunch or zealous than Cox, and he (O'Connor) had the strongest proof of it. It was when General O'Connor was in the Tower of Dublin that Cox set up the "Union Star"; and the first thing General O'Connor did, on coming out of the Tower of Dublin, was to convince Cox of the evil his paper was capable of producing, and instantly he discontinued it. It would be absurd to suppose the government could support a journal that made them all tremble for their lives.

As far as he could learn, no one betrayed Lord Ed-

ward Fitzgerald. He believes the imprudent visits Neilson paid him were the cause of his being discovered. Certainly Neilson never betrayed him.

The paper called the "Harp of Erin," published in Cork, was established chiefly by Roger O'Connor, and was almost exclusively filled by him.[1]

The "Press" was the paper of Arthur O'Connor. He believes the letters signed "Marcus" were written by Swift. He does not now recollect who wrote under the signature "Montanus." At this day it is utterly impossible to discover the authors of what was written in the "Press." The box for the articles was generally so full that the editor had but to select, and that without occupying himself with the names of the authors, a thing so studiously avoided; for instance, we had reason to think that Dr. Drennan wrote for the "Press," but as he was cautious, we denied it.

A great many of the apparent supporters of government made offers of their services to him (O'Connor) under the seal of secrecy, but their object was to have two strings to their bow.

He was kept in solitary imprisonment in the Birmingham Tower, in Dublin, six months; in the Tower of London, two months; in the Maidstone prison, three months; in the Marshalsea prison in Dublin, three months; in Kilmainham prison, three months; in Newgate, about two months; and four years and three months at Fort George, in Scotland.

[Thomas Addis Emmet and M'Neven set themselves

[1] The "Harp of Erin" was suppressed the 24th of March, 1798.

at the head of a faction from jealousy against him (General O'Connor), at Fort George; this faction was reorganized in Paris in 1803, so that the whole of the plans connected with Robert Emmet's plot, were directed by the faction, but were not communicated to him by them.[1]]

Robert Emmet's plans were divulged to him by the French government, who continued to treat with him as the accredited Irish ambassador, recognized as such by it, and known only as such by the Irish directory. The person in Paris, who in this party had the most influence, was Russell, and the project devised by him and Emmet gave the finishing blow to the United Irish confederacy. Dowdall was engaged in this plot, but he knows not what became of him. Buonaparte, in conversing with General O'Connor, expressed himself unfavourably of the attempt and of those engaged in it.

[He (O'Connor) was apprised of the insurrection in 1803, but had no part in it; he looked on it as an act of madness. He had no connection with the Emmets, disapproved of them both; one for his cowardice, the other for his folly and rashness, that ruined the union. As to Robert Emmet's attempt, how call that a plan which vanished in smoke the moment it saw the light, and that instantly ended in the ruin of all those that were engaged in it? If those in France, who excited Robert Emmet, were in Ireland when the attempt was made, they would have been the first to condemn it as the height of madness—his brother Thomas the first; but they were so unhappy in their exile in

[1] This passage was omitted in the first edition.

France, that they hazarded everything in Ireland that offered them a chance of their return.[1]]

Despard's attempt in England was wholly foreign to the affairs of Ireland. He (General O'Connor) knows not that Robert Emmet came to Paris previously to the insurrection in 1803. Allen, who was constantly with Robert Emmet, and who gave General O'Connor a most minute account of their mad project, never hinted that he (Robert Emmet) had quitted Dublin at all. As to Thomas Addis Emmet's knowledge of his brother Robert's intended attempt in 1803, there is no doubt he did know it. Thomas Addis Emmet communicated their plans to the French government, from whom he (General O'Connor) had them.

[When General O'Connor first applied to Thomas Emmet to be of the directory, with Jackson and Bond, he declined it, saying he did not feel firm enough to take part in an insurrection. It was not until General O'Connor was confined in the Tower that Emmet ventured to be of the directory. It was then his timidity paralyzed the directory, by threatening to go to the Castle if they persisted in commencing the insurrection. This was not the only occasion when Lord Edward Fitzgerald and General O'Connor were prevented from acting by the cowardice of some men they confided in.[2]]

[1] This passage, likewise, was omitted in the first edition.

[2] The preceding passages in brackets, respecting the Emmets, from the same feeling of reluctance to hurt the reputation of General O'Connor, which I explained in a previous note, I omitted in the first edition of this work; and for the same reasons which I stated in regard to General O'Connor's injurious strictures on the Catholic leaders, I now publish the preceding

It was in 1803 that Buonaparte gave his opinion to O'Connor, that Ireland contained but two millions. He read it in some old geography.

The place of the intended debarkment of Hoche's expedition has never transpired; the knowledge of it was confined to Hoche and himself. Despard's attempt was wholly foreign to the affairs of Ireland.

The Sheareses had very little to do in the Union; they acted without the Union, and of themselves, and for a short time only before they were cut off; the fact is, they did not make themselves known to the directory. As to M'Cabe, the French government acquired the proof that he was a double spy. General O'Connor saved his life with the Minister of War, the Duke of Feltre, after it had been discovered that in London he had intercourse with persons in some of the public offices in Downing Street.

The "Biographie des Contemporains" gives a most erroneous and incorrect list of what O'Connor has published. The following is a correct list of his published writings:—a Pamphlet, in 1794, signed, "A Stoic," entitled, "The Measures of the Ministry to prevent a Revolution, are the certain Means of bringing it on;" published by Sweeney, Cork, and Eaton, 74 Newgate Street; his Speech on the Catholic Question, May 4, 1795; his "State of Ireland," in 1798, addressed to the Irish nation; two addresses to the free electors of the county of Antrim, one of October 22, 1796, the other January 20, 1797; his "Letter to Lord Castle-

most unjust observations of General O'Connor in relation to Thomas Addis Emmet; but to this subject I will have to refer elsewhere.—R. R. M.

reagh from his Prison," January, 1797; in 1803, "The State of Great Britain: a Letter to General Lafayette," published at Paris in French, and in London in English, in 1831. He has kept no note of the numerous articles he has written in the newspapers.[1]

Thus far, the summary account of O'Connor's career, his connection with the society and relations with the leaders of United Irishmen, embodies the precise statements of O'Connor's written answers to the author's inquiries, which it seemed for obvious reasons desirable to present in O'Connor's own words, and in a continuous unbroken form, notwithstanding the unconnected nature of the information given, and the necessity of adverting in those replies to many important matters without reference to chronological order or arrangement.

The following letter accompanied the replies of General O'Connor:—

FROM GENERAL ARTHUR O'CONNOR TO R. R. MADDEN.

Bignon, Sept. 24, 1842.

My dear Madden,—I have just received your letter of the 20th of this month with your questions. Though I am but just recovered from a severe illness, I hasten to furnish you with answers to your questions. By the nature of these I find you have drawn your information from erroneous sources. You seem to imagine

[1] Replies of Arthur O'Connor to queries addressed to him by R. R. M. in 1842.

Cox was a false United Irishman while the Union lasted, whereas I have the most singularly honourable positive proof that he was firm against the greatest temptations offered by government; whatever failure was in him (of which I know nothing) was after the Union was dissolved. You seem to think the Sheares were leading men in the Union, whereas I may say they never entered it, so as to be known to us. The fact is, they were just entering it when they were cut off. It was the younger Sheares' proclamation, which was an act purely personal, without the knowledge or concurrence of the Union, that has misled some to think he and his brother were deeply engaged in the Union. They had the misfortune to communicate with Armstrong, who betrayed them. The elder Sheares was an aristocrat, the younger an ardent democrat, and led his brother with him.

The "Dictionary Biographique des Contemporains" is a work so full of errors, that it has no species of credit; it now sells, the five volumes, on the quays of Paris for ten francs. All it says of me, Condorcet, and of Madame Condorcet, is nearly all false. It makes me the author of works I never wrote, and does not give those I wrote. I am occupied with my memoirs, but what you may write will not interfere with them. My memoirs will take in all I have to say of the Union, from the beginning to the end. There is a wide field, and room enough for all that wish to write on the subject.

I had never heard of your work until I got your letter, not having seen it advertised in any paper, French or English. You will oblige me by depositing

a copy of your work at your lodgings at Paris, and if you will have left it, my friend Isambert will call for it, and pay for it; he will send it to me; I will take great interest in reading it. There is not a greater example of national ingratitude than that which the after generation have shown to the United Irish, to whose noble sacrifices they owe their freedom. This has been greatly owing to the vile calumnies O'Connell has been constantly propagating against the United Irish, all from that jealousy that devours him of every one that serves Ireland disinterestedly. What would be this man but for the efforts of the United Irish, of whom 30,000 have given their lives for their enslaved country? He could not be a priest but at the risk of his life, nor a hedge-schoolmaster. He accuses us of drawing the sword. Ireland had lain for a century and more under the imputation of low cowardly slaves, who had not the spirit to vindicate her rights. It was imperatively essential we should show our oppressors we had the spirit to reclaim our rights; this we did, and by so doing we have convinced England it was impossible to longer withhold Catholic emancipation and reform. The United Irish will live in history as the fathers of Irish liberty, when O'Connell will appear as their calumniator.

There was a time when a little faction that grew up in the Union, that was devoured by envy of Lord Edward Fitzgerald and me, set up the calumny that I had received sums from the Catholics. Never in my life did I ever accept one penny from the Catholics, but I expended in my negotiations and other ways of promoting the Union, a considerable part of my per-

sonal fortune; a marked difference between me and my great calumniator. My memoirs will clear up these things and a great many others that seem to be wholly misunderstood by the present generation. It is a sacred duty for me to vindicate the generous generation of United Irishmen from the calumnies of their ungrateful detractors. I will do it without passion or partiality, but with such proof as shall convince the most unwilling, of the noble and just efforts of my United countrymen, and of the infamy of their calumniators.

I have been told that O'Connell, pushed by his jealousy of the United Irish, has permitted himself the most unwarrantable and sacrilegious epithets against some United Irish in exile in America. It is not only a great and black ingratitude, but a great want of common sense, for it must all fall back on himself.

Yours most sincerely,

A. O'CONNOR.

Au Chateau du Bignon, par Fontenay,
Dept. du Loiret,
September 24th, 1842.

For some years previous to O'Connor's death he had been engaged in writing his own memoirs. But many important circumstances in connection with that undertaking, and, after his death, the difficulties of the task imposed on the editor of his memoirs, which have come to my knowledge, make it very desirable, in my opinion, to present the public in these countries with a more

detailed account of O'Connor's career than has been given in the first edition of this work, or is now likely to be given elsewhere. Justice alone to the memory of one of O'Connor's most eminent, most honourable and virtuous associates, Thomas Addis Emmet, would render it necessary to do so. Justice likewise to the memory of O'Connell makes it necessary to adopt this course; for without reference to the lately-published opinions of O'Connor on religious subjects, no just estimate could be formed of that rabid hostility against the great Catholic leader, which he has indulged in the expression of so unscrupulously and so unsparingly.

O'Connor set out in life an aristocrat, connected with aristocracy, and associated with the proprietary and oligarchy of the country—with university men of high-church principles, and country gentlemen of a superior grade to the shoneens of the Irish magisterial bench—with grand jurymen, and "Life and Fortune pledgers" at county meetings of rampant ascendency Tories—the Irish provincial bashaws of "three tails" and "two buttons."

His manners, external appearance, bearing in public, and demeanour in society, his notions of all things in general, with one exception, were aristocratic. In his political principles, Arthur O'Connor was a democrat. He was so from the beginning of his public career, and he continued

to the close not only of it, but of his life, the same, without any change, or any apparent power of comprehending how any rational human being could possibly be anything but a democrat. His democratic sentiments, however, were kept in abeyance so long as it was possible for a man of O'Connor's impulsive nature to restrain them.

In 1795 he came out for the first time in his true political character in his place in parliament, on the Catholic question, in a speech which electrified the house, horrified his uncle, Lord Longueville, destroyed his interests and expectations in that quarter, and which seized fast hold of the hearts of the people of Ireland.

From that day, the progress of O'Connor's political life was one of steady advancement—an obvious onward movement from the starting-post of reform to an inevitable result—a rebellion engaged in for republican institutions and national independence.

Political economy was his favourite study; and it was his own opinion (expressed on many occasions to the author) that the natural bent of his genius and peculiar turn of mind was to that pursuit. He gave evidence of that opinion in his great work, " The revised edition of all the works of Condorcet," which he published in conjunction with Mons. M. F. Arago, in twenty vols. 8vo;

and his latest work in English, entitled "Monopoly the Cause of all Evil," published in Paris in 1848, in three vols. 8vo.

O'Connor became a United Irishman in 1796; but previously to his formal connection with the society, he was on divers occasions consulted by their leaders.

Of each of the directories O'Connor was a member; but it was in the Leinster Directory where he exercised most influence and took a foremost part in the affairs of the society.

The councils of that body were by no means remarkable for their unanimity. It is well known that one party in it was entirely opposed to any outbreak or rebellion without adequate assistance from France, in the way of men, arms, ammunition, and money. From the time T. A. Emmet became a member of the directory, he was the organ of that party and the exponent of that opinion; and outside of the directory he had that opinion advocated in the committees of the United Irishmen and the circles of a social kind, comprising the upper classes of the mercantile and professional communities, in which the objects of the society were carried out and promoted largely by the late W. M. of Dublin—a man of powerful intellect, singularly sagacious and far-seeing, of inflexible purpose and great solidity of judgment, wanting no great quality

to constitute a man of first-rate power in revolutionary times, except promptitude in council, when a decision was to be come to, when the time for action came. The period of deliberation with him was never over; the process of mental examination was a peculiar one with him. When a subject for inquiry was presented to his mind, his first step was to isolate it, and fix its place in some sphere of thought where no surrounding influences could affect it. He never approached it in a straight line from the circumference, but always walked round it in circles, diminishing the distance so slowly as he went on, that the progress he made was hardly perceptible to those who anxiously awaited the result of his circuitous deliberation. This process, it must be confessed, would have done better in the antediluvian days of Noah, when men ordinarily lived half a thousand years, more or less, than in those degenerate times of ours, when, the Deluge having so seriously abbreviated the duration of human life, seventy years is a good round age for any temperate gentleman, who is not an author, to attain to. But Emmet's confidential friend, W. M., was a wise and sober-minded man; and Emmet, though he was a drag in the directory on the movement party, who would risk an outbreak without French aid of any kind, it is manifest enough on the face of Tone's journals, had not been tardy in coming to the conclusion that

French aid was essential to the success of the cause of the United Irishmen, nor remiss in seeking to obtain it so early even as 1794.

O'Connor was at the head of the party who, though desirous to obtain French aid, were ultimately ready to risk a rising of the people without it. There certainly were times when any unaided attempt would have been more propitious than the latter part of 1797 or beginning of 1798, or any period after the arrests of the principal members of the Directory, and of the members of the Committee at Bond's, in the March of the latter year.

But on the question at issue between those leaders of the United Irishmen who can now call in question the wisdom of those councils of Thomas Addis Emmet, which suggested that the country should not be committed in a formidable struggle, of tremendous importance to its people's lives and liberty, without such aid from another country as might afford a fair chance of success?

CHAPTER II

THE "PRESS" AND ITS WRITERS

THE United Irishmen were certainly well served by their pensmen and the "Press" which represented their opinions and advocated their cause.

The newspapers and pamphlet literature of later times in Ireland will not suffer by a comparison in regard to ability with that of the "Press," the "Northern Star," the pamphlets of Tone, Drennan, Stokes, Sampson, and O'Connor.

The violence of Lord Clare in the House of Lords, was imitated, as far as invective went, in the years 1797 and 1798, in the columns of the "Press" newspaper, the organ of the United Irishmen. There are, however, few newspapers of the present day which display more literary talent, than that ably written, yet intemperately conducted paper exhibited.

The "Press" made it first appearance the 28th of September, 1797. The sixty-eighth number was seized the morning of its intended publication, and the paper was finally put down by the strong hand of military power, the 6th

of March, 1798. It was published from the beginning of November at Mr. Stockdale's printing establishment, No. 62 Abbey Street, now No. 72; the virtual proprietor of the paper was Mr. Arthur O'Connor: the sworn, but it must be added the nominal proprietor, was Mr. Peter Finnerty. In each number of the paper, up to the 30th of December, 1797, printed, we find the words, "P. Finnerty, printer, at No. 4, Church Lane;" but from that date A. O'Connor's name is substituted for that of Finnerty as printer.

A venerable man, now verging on his eightieth year, well known to the author, and respected by all who know him, Mr. Flanagan, who was a printer and was engaged in the office of the "Press" newspaper in 1797 and the early part of 1798, has given an account of the origin and management of that paper, such as no other person now living (perhaps with one exception) could supply.

In the latter end of 1797 the leaders of the United cause established a newspaper entitled the "Press," to forward the movement for the liberation of Ireland. The first seventeen numbers were printed by Mr. Whitworth, an Englishman, in Upper Exchange Street, Dublin. The subsequently celebrated Peter Finnerty, who was to have been a compositor on it, was introduced to Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Arthur O'Connor, who found him to be a man of great talent, tact, and patriotism. They at once decided that he should

be employed at the publishing office in Church Lane, College Green, where he had to conduct some very important correspondence for the United Irishmen. His name appeared at the bottom of the paper as the printer to the "Press," and Lord Edward Fitzgerald on several occasions expressed his entire approval of Peter Finnerty's conduct.

The first editor was Mr. Brennan, a very able writer, but a man of questionable integrity, as subsequent events proved. Brennan having been committed to jail for debt, he wrote to the proprietors to the effect that if they did not pay his debts immediately, he would place all the MSS. which he had in his possession in the hands of the Castle authorities. Brennan's threat was treated with contempt, and Arthur O'Connor wrote to him in these words: "If you wish to act a base, dishonourable part towards us and the righteous cause you have engaged to sustain, we must regret it, we must likewise regret having been associated with a man capable of such baseness. Do your utmost. Posterity shall decide upon the rectitude of the cause you have expressed your intention of betraying."

In a few days after Brennan was liberated from prison by the government, who, no doubt, perceived that he was worth purchasing; but I am not aware of his having appeared before the public again in connection with politics.

The aspect of Irish affairs looking very perilous, and prosecution following prosecution, Mr. Whitworth declined printing the "Press" any longer. Mr. Stockdale of Abbey Street brought out the eighteenth

number, and continued to print it as long as it was permitted by the government.

When Finnerty was found guilty of a libel, another name was obliged to be entered at the stamp office. Arthur O'Connor's name was then attached to it. Although there were upwards of 3,000 copies struck off each publication (Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday evenings), the day that Arthur O'Connor's name was announced as printer, it got a rise of 1,500, and increased to 6,000, which was the utmost that could be printed in time by the presses in use at that period. The name of Arthur O'Connor was everywhere received with enthusiasm by the people, particularly in the counties of Kildare and Meath. In truth, almost all Protestants who espoused the United cause, were generous, disinterested, noble-minded men, who truly loved fatherland. What a contrast with the "Soupers" of these days!

At the time Finnerty was sentenced to be pilloried at the front of Newgate, Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Arthur O'Connor went to Green Street to encourage him while in the pillory. There were several thousands present, and the people seemed much excited. When they reached the guard of soldiers, Lord Edward endeavoured to pass one of them. The soldier raised his gun, and was about to strike him, when the high sheriff (Mr. Pemberton) immediately advanced, and ordered him not to act without orders. He then gave directions to the officer in command of the guard to allow Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Mr. O'Connor to pass. They both continued near Finnerty during the time he was suffering the penalty. The high sheriff

seemed puzzled how to act; but owing to his mild and conciliatory conduct to the people, all passed off quietly.

Immediately after leaving Green Street, Lord Edward and O'Connor went to Stockdale's office. Having entered into conversation about what had taken place with the soldier, his lordship took two small pistols from his waistcoat pockets, and said that if the soldier had struck him, he would have shot him dead. If that had taken place, I am confident the entire guard would have been disarmed in a few minutes, for the crowd was so close to them at that moment, that they would not be able to use their muskets. Lord Edward Fitzgerald was the most determined man I have ever seen.

So hostile were the low Orangemen to the "Press" newspaper, that the messengers who carried the papers from the printer to the publishing office in Church Lane, were, on several occasions, waylaid, in consequence of which the printers formed themselves into a guard to protect the newspapers the men were conveying.

Counsellor Sampson was the last conductor of the "Press." The paper continued to be printed until the sixty-eighth number, when a guard of the Cavan militia, under the command of a rampant Orangeman, Maxwell, came and seized the office, carried away all the newspapers that had been printed, and destroyed the type, presses, etc., in a wanton manner.[1]

[1] Alderman Alexander accompanied the military party, and represented the civil authority in a magisterial capacity on this occasion.

While the "Press" continued to be printed at Stockdale's, one of the apprentices, William Powell, was passing through Back Lane, and hearing some noise proceeding from a public-house, he stopped to ask a man at the door what was the matter. The fellow immediately collared him, and he was dragged in. Powell then discovered that he was in the custody of no less a personage than Jemmy O'Brien, who had been placed at the door by Major Sirr. The major had got information that Serjeant Downes, of the King's County militia (who had been appointed to a post in the rebel army) was in the house, and had gone with his party to arrest him. Downes had his regimentals on, and as soon as he saw the Major enter the room, he attempted to draw his sword, but his arm was seized by the powerful grasp of an assistant, and he was immediately surrounded by the whole gang. Jemmy O'Brien all the time was stationed at the door. Powell and Downes were then handcuffed, and marched to the Castle guard-house. Serjeant Downes asked Powell his name, and as he thought his young companion was alarmed by his confinement, desired him to keep up his spirits, as they had no charge against him, and had only seized him to prevent his giving any alarm; but (said he) as to me, before the next day's sun will set I will be in eternity! After conversing for a while with Powell, he lay down on the guard-bed and slept for three hours. When he awoke, he rallied Powell again, as he appeared to be much fretted, and said he would give him a song; he accordingly gave, in very good style, *Paddies Evermore.* At six o'clock in the morning a guard arrived at the door,

and commanded Serjeant Downes to be led forth. Downes then bid Powell farewell, and was conveyed to the camp at the Naul: he was tried that day by a court martial, and *immediately shot!* Poor Downes! I knew him well. His fate was deeply regretted by all who were connected with the movement. Serjeant Downes was a remarkably fine young man, brave and zealous.

John Stockdale, the publisher of the "Press" newspaper, was committed to Kilmainham jail in 1797, for refusing to answer certain queries put to him by the House of Lords. He remained in prison six months, and during that period his property in types, presses, etc., was destroyed by the military and civil authorities.

In 1803, he was implicated in the insurrection of Robert Emmet, and was again imprisoned on the charge of printing the proclamation of Emmet, and remained in confinement nearly two years. He came out of jail a ruined man; he met with no assistance from those whose battles he had fought in his paper; neither from the "patriots" nor the "Catholics." He died in Abbey Street, Dublin, the 11th January, 1813.

So much for the recollections of a surviving compositor on the "Press" newspaper.

The letters in the "Press" signed FORTESQUE were evidently written by a lawyer; the subject of them is generally the illegality of the proceedings which had superseded the trial by jury, the excesses committed by the military, or the tor-

tures inflicted on the people. Sampson states, in his Memoirs, that many of the accounts of these enormities published in the "Press" were written by him, but he does not state under what signature: that of FORTESQUE, however, may probably be regarded as having been suggested by the quality with which the name of Sampson is associated. He was certainly supposed to be "the manager of the Press," and was called so by Lord Moira in one of his letters to him.

In reply to Lord Moira's assertion he says: "The paper was set up when I was in the country, and was continued some time before I ever saw it." . . . "The use made of the 'Press' was to publish those facts, of which you were desirous also to be the publisher—the suppression and subsequent impunity of which (facts) you seemed to foresee, as well as I did, would lead to rebellion."[1]

The facts he alludes to, were the statements, verified on oath, of numerous atrocities, such as half-hangings, scourgings and picketings, which he had drawn up and presented to Lord Moira, and which his lordship, on two occasions, laid many of the details of before parliament, and which he undertook to prove at the bar of the house, if a committee of inquiry would be granted for this investigation. But such an inquiry was not compatible with the reputation of Lords

[1] Sampson's Memoirs; Introduction, p. 66.

Clare and Castlereagh, or the interests of the faction which then constituted the "imperium in imperio" in Ireland.

Sampson, in the latter part of 1797, had formed "a Society for obtaining Authentic Information of Outrages committed on the People;" the object of which society, he says, was, "by the disclosure of these enormities, to restrain the perpetrators of them, and to render it impossible for the government, which had hitherto connived at these proceedings, to plead ignorance of them." "The members of it," he says, "were men undoubtedly the most distinguished in Ireland, such as Grattan, the Ponsonbys, Curran, Fletcher, the brave Montgomery," etc. "We had proceeded," he adds, "some time with effect, in despite of the reigning horror;—and never were more tragical stories wrested from oblivion."

So long as there was an organ in Ireland for the publication of these statements, there was a sort of control over the violence of Orangeism; but when the "'Press' was put down by military force, there were no bounds to the excesses."

The members of parliament themselves, of the opposition party, were insulted by insinuations prejudicial to their loyalty,—nay, some of them were openly taunted, as persons who were aiders and abettors of traitors.

The 15th of May, 1797, Mr. Grattan announced the determination of himself and his friends to the ministers, to secede from parliament:—"Having no hopes left to persuade or dissuade, and having discharged our duties, we shall trouble you no more; and after this day shall not attend the House of Commons."[1] Much blame has been thrown on Messrs. Grattan, Ponsonby, and Curran, for abandoning their posts at this fearful crisis. But the fact is, they knew their own lives and liberty, and (what was dearer than either) their reputation, was in peril; and there was no security for any man of their party from the malevolence of that Orange faction which then swayed the council, the viceroy, and even Castlereagh himself.

The suppression of the "Press" had been determined on, to prevent the intended publication of an attack on Lord Clare, particularly and personally offensive to his lordship, information of it having been given to the Government by some one in the office. The article was already in print, when the house where the paper was printed in Mountrath Street, and the office where it was published in Abbey Street, were taken possession of by a military force under the direction of the high sheriff. This letter, addressed to "the Author of Coercion," and signed DION, probably written by John Sheares, is to be

[1] Grattan's Speeches, vol. iii., p. 342.

found in a volume called "The Beauties of the Press," published in London in 1800.

Sampson, who lived within a few doors of the office, had been sent for by the wife of the printer, then in jail, when the seizure was made by the high-sheriff, assisted by a large military force.[1] He says:—"I learned afterwards, that the investment and occupation of Mr. Stockdale's house was to prevent an intended publication from circulating in the 'Press' against Lord Clare."

Among the contributors to the "Press," there were men of the first eminence in literature, and one (Thomas Moore) whose fame was yet unwon, and whose dawning talents were then hardly known beyond the precincts of the college. His first production in prose, he informs us, in his life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, appeared in the columns of the "Press" before he had attained his seventeenth year. He does not say under what signature he wrote for that paper: but some of the pieces, he states, which were inserted in the secret report of the committee of the House of Commons, and given to the public as specimens of the "alarming writings" of the "Press," were his. There are some lines on Mr. Pitt, signed TOMMY TRUANT, in one of the Janu-

[1] It has been stated in several publications that Lord Edward Fitzgerald was present on this occasion; but Sampson positively states that he was not there.

ary numbers of the year 1798, the author of which probably contributed other pieces of poetry to that paper.

There is one piece displaying a great deal of talent, called "The London Pride and Shamrock," in No. 11 of the "Press," signed TREBOR, which I believe to be the production of that most highly gifted and ill-fated of our countrymen—the unfortunate Robert Emmet. The letters of the signature reversed, will be found to be those which compose the name "Robert." Before I noticed this circumstance, I was struck with the simplicity, the sombre cast of thought, the ardent enthusiasm which is displayed in these verses. John Sheares was one of the latest writers in this paper.

Another contributor to the "Press," on the authority of Dr. M'Neven, it may be stated, was Mr. William Preston, one of the most distinguished scholars of Trinity College in his time, by the acknowledgment even of one not very favourable to his politics, Dr. Patrick Duigenan. (See *Lacrimæ Academicæ.*)

Preston was a member of the well-known society established by Yelverton and Curran, "The Monks of St. Patrick."

He was the author of the "Argonautics of Appollonius Rhodius," translated into English verse, of several poems and dramatic pieces, and a contributor to the production called "Prance-

riana," a satirical piece, written against Dr. Hutchinson, Provost of Trinity College, in 1774. The Numbers 16, 24, 25, 29, 31 and 33, were written by Preston, Dr. Duigenan was one of the principal contributors. As one of the founders of the Royal Irish Academy and of the Dublin Library, the name of Preston is associated with those of Charlemont and others of the foremost men of his day. Preston was a man of great literary attainments, "his mind was stored with Roman and Grecian literature." For several years before his death, he filled the office of commissioner of appeals, and died in Dublin, in January, 1807, in his fifty-sixth year.

The writings in the "Press" most distinguished for their ability, were those which bear the names of MARCUS, WM. CAXTON, SARSFIELD, FORTESQUE, SCÆVOLA, A MILITIA OFFICER, and DION. Those under the signature of MONTANUS, eleven in number, are written with great power, and bear evident marks of a mind deeply imbued with political and legal knowledge, and an intimate acquaintance with the character and condition of the people. The spirit which breathes in these letters, is that of a calm determination, an imperturbable disposition, a nature softened by philosophy, insensible to fear, and influenced by no sordid or selfish motive. The author of these letters, on the authority of the late Dr.

M'Neven in a statement to the author (who ought to have known the person he believes to have been the writer of them better than any body else), was Thomas Addis Emmet. It may be observed, that a statement in the latter part of 1797 (though not in itself entitled to much respect as an authority) appeared in the "Dublin Journal," in which the writer declared that he had seen one of the manuscript letters signed MONTANUS, in the handwriting of Thomas Addis Emmet.

A prosecution was instituted against the "Press" in 1798, for seditious libel on Lord Camden's government, contained in certain letters which appeared in that paper in the latter part of 1797. The subject matter of the libel in the "Press," signed MARCUS (for the publication of which the printer was prosecuted by the government), was the refusal of Lord Camden to extend mercy to a person of the name of William Orr, of respectability, and remarkable for his popularity, who had been capitally convicted at Carrickfergus of administering the oath of the United Irishmen's Society, and was the first person who had been so convicted. Poems were written, sermons were preached; after-dinner speeches, and after supper still stronger speeches, were made, of no ordinary vehemence, about the fate of Orr and the conduct of Lord Camden, which certainly, in the peculiar circum-

stances of this case, was bad, or rather stupidly base and iniquitously unjust.

The scribes of the United Irishmen wrote up the memory of the man whom Camden had allowed to be executed with a full knowledge of the foul means taken to obtain a conviction, officially conveyed to him by persons every way worthy of credit and of undoubted loyalty.

The evident object of the efforts to make this cry, "Remember Orr," stir up the people to rebellion, cannot be mistaken—that object was to single out an individual case of suffering for the cause of the Union, for the sympathy of the nation, and to turn that sympathy to the account of the cause. Orr's case presented to the people of Ireland, at that period, a few extraordinary features of iniquity and injustice. He was a noted, active, and popular country member of the society of United Irishmen. He was executed on account of the notoriety of that circumstance, but not on account of the sufficiency of the evidence or the justice of the conviction that was obtained against him; for the crown witness, Wheatly, immediately after the trial, acknowledged that he had perjured himself; and some of the jury came forward likewise, and admitted that they were drunk when they gave their verdict; and these facts, duly deposed to and attested, were laid before the viceroy, Lord Cam-

den, by Sir John Macartney, the magistrate who had caused Orr to be arrested, and who, to his honour be it told, when he found the practices that had been resorted to, used every effort, though fruitlessly, to move Lord Camden to save the prisoner.[1] Orr was executed, I repeat it, on account of the notoriety of his connection with the United Irish system, but not on account of the crime legally laid to his charge.

William Orr, of Ferranshane, in the county of Antrim, was charged with administering the United Irishman's oath, in his own house, to a soldier of the name of Wheatly. He was the first person indicted under the act which made that offence a capital felony (36 Geo. III.). His father was a small farmer in comfortable circumstances, and the proprietor of a bleach-green. James Hope, who was intimately acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, informs me, "that William Orr was not actually the person who administered the oath to the soldier. The person who administered the oath was William M'Keever, a delegate from the city

[1] These facts were admitted to me to be correctly stated, as they are given in the publication of the day, by the son of Sir John Macartney, the Rev. A. Macartney, the vicar of Belfast, in a conversation which I had with him; on which occasion he informed me of the particulars of the arrest of Orr, which had been effected by him in September, 1797. This gentleman would have served the party to which he unfortunately belonged at the expense of his life, but, to the best of my opinion, not at the expense of truth.—R. R. M.

of Derry to the Provincial Committee, who afterwards made his escape to America."

In a letter to Miss M'Cracken, dated 27th of September, 1797, addressed to her brother, then in Kilmainham jail, I find the following reference to the recent trial of Orr:

Orr's trial has clearly proved, that there is neither justice nor mercy to be expected. Even the greatest aristocrats here join in lamenting his fate; but his greatness of mind renders him rather an object of envy and admiration than of compassion. I am told that his wife is gone with a letter from Lady Londonderry to her brother on his behalf. . . . You will be surprised when I tell you that old Alexander Thompson, of Cushendall, was foreman of the jury, and is thought will lose his senses if Mr. Orr's sentence is carried into execution, as he appears already quite distracted at the idea of a person being condemned to die through his ignorance, as it seems he did not at all understand the business of a juryman. However, he held out from the forenoon till six o'clock in the morning of the day following, though, it is said, he was beaten, and threatened with being wrecked, and not left a six-pence in the world, on his refusing to bring in a verdict of guilty. Neither would they let him taste of the supper and the drink which was sent to the rest, and of which they partook to such a beastly degree. It was not, therefore, much to be wondered at, that an infirm old man should not have sufficient resolution to hold out against such treatment.

(Signed) MARY M'CRACKEN.

The report given in the "Press" of the 29th of October, 1797, is said to have been furnished by an eminent short-hand writer. Orr was defended by Curran and Sampson. The judges before whom he was tried were, Lord Yelverton and Judge Chamberlaine. The jury retired at six in the evening to consider their verdict. They sat up, deliberating, all night, and returned into court at six the following morning. The jury inquired if they might find a qualified verdict as to the prisoner's guilt. The judge directed them to give a special verdict on the general issue. They retired again, and returned shortly with a verdict of guilty, and a strong recommendation of the prisoner to mercy. Next day Orr was brought up for judgment, when, after an unsuccessful motion in arrest of judgment, chiefly on the grounds of the drunkenness of the jury, which Judge Chamberlaine would not admit of being made "the foundation of any motion of the court," Lord Yelverton pronounced sentence of death "in a voice scarcely articulate, and at the conclusion of his address burst into tears." Orr said, pointing to the jury, "That jury has convicted me of being a felon. My own heart tells me that their conviction is a falsehood, and that I am not a felon. If they have found me guilty improperly, it is worse for them than for me. I can forgive them. I wish to say only one word more, and that is, to declare on this awful

occasion, and in the presence of God, that the evidence against me was grossly perjured—grossly and wickedly perjured!"

The witness Wheatly made an affidavit before a magistrate, acknowledging his having sworn falsely against Orr. Two of the jury made depositions, setting forth that they had been induced to give a verdict contrary to their opinion, when under the influence of liquor. Two others made statements that they had been menaced by the other jurors with denunciations and the wrecking of their properties, if they did not comply with their wishes. The following persons composed Mr. Orr's jury:—Archibald Thompson, George Crooks, James M'Naghten, George Pentland, J. Bell, George Dickson, Samuel Semphill, William Laughlin, George Casement, Arthur Johnston, John Hall, and George Patterson.

James Orr, in the "Press" newspaper of the 28th of October, 1797, published a statement respecting his interference, with a view of saving his brother's life, to the following effect:—

He, James Orr, had been applied to by many gentlemen to get his brother William to make a confession of his guilt, as a condition on which they would use their interest to have his life spared. The high sheriff, Mr. Skeffington, and the sovereign of Belfast, the Rev. Mr. Bristowe, were among the number—the

former undertaking to get the grand jury to sign a memorial in his favour. James Orr immediately went to his brother, and the latter indignantly refused to make any such confession, for "he had not been guilty of the crime he was charged with." James Orr not being able to induce him to sign it, returned to Belfast and wrote out a confession, similar in terms to that required by Skeffington and Bristowe, and forged his brother's name. The forged document was then turned to the account it was required for. A respite was then granted; but the weakness of the brother was made instrumental to the death of the prisoner. The shaken verdict of the drunken jury, of the perjured witness, was not suffered to preserve the prisoner. The forged testimony of his guilt was brought against him. The promises under which that document was obtained were forgotten, and thus "a surreptitious declaration," swindled from the fears of an afflicted family, was made the instrument to intercept the stream of mercy, and counteract the report of the judge (one of the judges, namely, Lord Yelverton) who tried him.

Orr was executed outside of Carrickfergus, on the 14th of October, 1797, in his thirty-first year, solemnly protesting his innocence of the crime laid to his charge.

The act of James Orr might have led the executive into error; but William Orr wrote a letter to Lord Camden, dated the 10th of October, plainly informing his lordship of the forgery committed by his brother, and that the con-

fession imputed to him "was base and false;" but stating, if mercy was extended to him, "he should not fail to entertain the most dutiful sense of gratitude for such an act of justice as well as mercy." On the day of the execution, the great body of the inhabitants of Carrickfergus quitted the town to avoid witnessing the fate of Orr.

A person who visited Orr previously to his trial, speaks of his personal appearance and address as highly prepossessing. His apparel was new and fashionable—there was a remarkable neatness in his attire. The only thing approaching the foppery of patriotism, was a narrow piece of green ribbon round his neck. He was six feet two inches in height, particularly well made—in fact, his person was a model of symmetry, strength, and gracefulness. He wore his hair short and well powdered. The expression of his countenance was frank and manly. He possessed a sound understanding, strong affections, and a kindly disposition. In speaking to his visitor of the state of the country, who remarked that the government was disposed to act in a conciliatory spirit towards the country, he said—"No, no; you may depend upon it that there is some system laid down, which has for its object murder and devastation." He added, respecting the treatment of the Dissenters as well as the Catholics, "Irishmen of every denomination must now stand or fall together."

Thus a variety of depositions establishing the drunkenness of the jury and the perjury of Wheatly were laid before the Lord Lieutenant. One deposition was of the Rev. George Macartney, a magistrate of the county Antrim, respecting Wheatly's being brought forward by Mr. Kemmis, and on his (Wheatly's) coming into court, relating to Mr. Macartney his having seen a Dissenting clergyman, of the name of Eder, whom he had known elsewhere, and was sure he was brought there to invalidate his testimony. Another deposition was that of the clergyman referred to, stating that he had accompanied a brother clergyman, the Rev. A. Montgomery, to visit a sick soldier, apparently deranged, named Wheatly, a Scotchman, who had attempted to commit suicide; that he confessed to Mrs. Hueys, in whose house he then was, that he was in Col. Durham's regiment, and had committed a murder, which weighed heavily upon his mind, and that he had been instigated to give false evidence against William Orr, of which crime he sincerely repented. A similar deposition, before Lord O'Neil, was made by the Rev. Mr. Montgomery. Two of the jury made depositions respecting their drunkenness. Two others made statements of the menaces that had been used by the other jurors. But all were of no avail. Lord Camden was deaf to all the representations made to him. All the waters of the

ocean will not wash away the stain his obduracy on this occasion has left on his character. Better fifty thousand times for his fame it were if he had never seen Ireland. The fate of Orr lies heavy on the memory of Lord Camden.

The friends of Earl Camden in vain seek to cast the responsibility of this act on his subordinates in the Irish government. They say he was a passive instrument in the hands of others. The prerogative of mercy, however, was given to him, and not to them. On the 26th of October (1797), a letter addressed to Earl Camden appeared in the "Press," signed MARCUS, ably and eloquently written, but unquestionably libellous, commenting on the conduct of his Lordship in this case. Marcus used those words in reference to it.—

> The death of Mr. Orr, the nation has pronounced one of the most sanguinary and savage acts that has disgraced the laws. Let not the nation be told that you are a passive instrument in the hands of others. If passive you be, then is your office a shadow indeed. If an active instrument as you ought to be, you did not perform the duty which the laws required of you. You did not exercise the prerogative of mercy—that mercy which the law entrusted to you for the safety of the subject. Innocent it appears he was. His blood has been shed, and the precedent is awful. . . . Feasting in your Castle in the midst of your myrmidons and bishops, you have little concerned yourself about the expelled and miserable cottager, whose

dwelling at the moment of your mirth was in flames, his wife or his daughter suffering violence at the hands of some commissioned ravager, his son agonizing on the bayonet, and his helpless infants crying in vain for mercy. These are lamentations that disturb not the hour of carousal or intoxicated counsels. The constitution has reeled to its centre—Justice herself is not only blind, but drunk, and deaf like Festus to the words of soberness and truth.

Let the awful execution of Mr. Orr be a lesson to all unthinking jurors, and let them cease to flatter themselves, that any interest, recommendation of theirs and of the presiding judge, can stop the course of carnage which sanguinary, and I do not fear to say, unconstitutional laws have ordered to be loosed. Let them remember that, like Macbeth, the servants of the crown have waded so far in blood, that they find it easier to go on than to go back.[1]

Finnerty was found guilty, and sentenced to be imprisoned for two years, to pay a fine of £20, and to give security for future good behaviour for seven years, himself for the sum of £500, and two sureties in £250 each.

Other letters bearing the signature of MARCUS, are remarkable for the impetuosity, energy, and boldness of their language. Traces are to be observed throughout those compositions, of a temperament whose ardour was under no control—of wild and luxuriant talents, subject to

[1] Ridgeway's Report of Trial of P. Finnerty, Dublin, 1798.

no restraint—of feelings, whose fervour in political matters was more indicative of a new-born zeal in a cause suddenly embraced, than of matured reflection on the political circumstances of the times, or the profitable result and adequacy of the means proposed for effecting a removal of existing evils.

In 1842, the late General Arthur O'Connor informed me that the author of the stirring treasonable letters against Lord Camden's government, published in the "Press" newspaper, the Dublin organ of the United Irishmen, under the signature MARCUS, was a Mr. Deane Swift. He and Dr. Drennan were the chief pensmen of the Dublin leaders; some of the strongest and most stirring leading articles in that paper were written by Swift, whom O'Connor believed had been long dead. Deane Swift was the eldest son of a very eccentric gentleman, Theophilus Swift, a descendant of the Godwin Swift, uncle of the man to whom the name is indebted for its celebrity.

Mr. O'Connor was mistaken in supposing that the writer of the letters signed MARCUS, in the "Press," had been long dead, as I subsequently learned from the keeper of the regalia in the Tower, that Mr. Deane Swift was still in being, 1860, and then residing at Gravesend, in comfortable circumstances, and highly respected by all classes.

My informant, who was then charged with the custody of her Majesty's crown, Edmond Lenthal Swift, Esq., was the brother of the formidable penman of the United Irishmen, Mr. Deane Swift, the MARCUS of the "Press," whose writings had so seriously troubled the repose of Lords Camden, Clare, and Castlereagh.

Having stated to Mr. E. L. Swift the account given me by General O'Connor as to the authorship of the MARCUS Letters, the impression was left on my mind that Mr. E. L. Swift concurred with me in that account. But I may be mistaken in that supposition.

E. L. Swift, Esq., was keeper of the regalia in the Tower so far back as July, 1817; and in 1847, when I last saw him, still held that office. He was an occasional contributor to the "Gentleman's Magazine."[1] In the number of that periodical for 1817, he published some verses on the death of the Princess Charlotte, entitled "The Heart," strangely contrasting with the effusions of his brother in the "Press" newspaper of 1797 and 1798, under the signature of MARCUS.

Deane Swift was a young man of considerable ability, an excellent scholar, a good Latin versifier, and an able writer. From the time of the war with the Fellows, and the composition of divers sarcastic epigrams on them, no more was

[1] "Gentleman's Magazine," July, 1817.

heard of young Deane Swift till the memorable year of 1798, when his name occurs in certain governmental documents, under the list of proscribed persons specified in the Fugitive Bill of 1798, representing him as a person not particularly loyal in his opinions; and then he disappears from the stage of Irish politics and the page of Irish history, and is only known to have quitted Ireland at the period above referred to, and not to have returned to it for many years.

The classical pen of that excellent writer, Dr. William Drennan, the friend of Dugald Stewart, was likewise employed in the "Press." He was, in fact, the chief penman of the United Irish Society. The first declaration of the Dublin society, and many of the addresses and resolutions of the society (of which, in the years 1792 and 1793, he was frequently the chairman), were written by him, as were also many of the songs and other political compositions which appeared in the "Press," and subsequently in "The Harp of Erin." In the former he published, 14th January, 1791, anonymously, amongst other pieces, the well known ode, "To the Memory of William Orr," beginning with the words, "Oh! wake him not with women's cries," a piece written with great power, and which, probably, had more effect on the public mind than any production of the day in prose or verse. This piece alone, with his song, "When Erin first rose," and that ad-

mirable paraphrase of the classical story, called "The Jewels of Cornelia," published the 4th of January, 1798, in the "Press," are to be found in a small volume of his, entitled, "Fugitive Pieces, in verse and prose," published in Belfast in 1815. In this volume, we find a poem called "Glendalough," and a number of hymns, which in any other country, where English poetry was prized, would have gained a high reputation for the writer; but Ireland, as to literature, is still in the condition described by Spencer:

> And in so fair a land as may be redd,
> Not one Parnassus, nor one Helicon
> Left for sweet Muses to be harboured.

Dr. Drennan was a member of a political and literary club, formed in 1790, by T. W. Tone; the other members were T. A. Emmet, Pollock, William Johnson, subsequently a judge, Whitley Stokes, Peter Burrowes, and Thomas Russell.

These spirit-stirring songs of Drennan, beautiful in their imagery, though certainly not calculated to allay the excitement of the public mind at that period, circulated with the utmost rapidity over the country, and became the standard songs of every convivial society where United Irishmen, or those who were friendly to their views, assembled. One of these songs of Drennan, to which I have alluded, was very remarkable for its highly poetical diction; it was called "Erin to

her own tune," beginning with the words, "When Erin first rose." Mr. Moore has paid the compliment to the merit of its composition, of adopting one of its beautiful images in those exquisite lines of his, at the close of the fiftieth number of his Melodies:—

> Dear harp of my country, in darkness I found thee,
> The cold chain of silence had hung o'er thee long.

In a note to that piece, whose numbers, "most musical, most melancholy," would alone be sufficient to make the name of Moore remembered in after times, the author says—"In that rebellious, but beautiful song, 'When Erin first rose,' etc., there is, if I recollect right, the following line:—

> The dark chain of silence was thrown o'er the deep."

In this song, Drennan first designated his country as the "Emerald Isle;" and I was assured by his widow, now residing in Belfast, that he prided himself not a little on the paternity of this title. This amiable lady, deservedly respected by all classes in Belfast, informed me that Dr. Drennan, at one period, had some idea of writing a history of the United Irish Society, but his other literary avocations prevented him carrying his purpose into effect. It is greatly to be regretted that he did not undertake this

task, for no person could have done so with equal advantage. His admirable letters, bearing the signature—ORELLANA, THE IRISH HELOT, which appeared in 1784, and those of Joseph Pollock, signed OWEN ROE O'NEILL, published about 1790, and those of Jebb, under the signature of GUATIMOZIN, are the ablest compositions of all the political literature of those times.

From the notes of two sons of Dr. Drennan, not unworthy of their name and origin, nor unmindful of their obligations to their father's memory, the following account of this remarkable man are given:—

William Drennan, born in Belfast, 23rd May, 1754, was the youngest of nine children, three only of whom survived the age of childhood. His father was the Rev. Thomas Drennan, minister of the First Presbyterian Congregation in Belfast. He married in 1741, Anne Lennox, daughter of Martha Hamilton and Robert Lennox. Martha Hamilton was daughter of John Hamilton, who, in 1672, purchased the townland of Ballymenentragh, in the county of Down, from the then Earl of Clanbrassil. This property Martha Hamilton, afterwards Lennox, inherited, and left two daughters, Martha Lennox, married to Alexander Young, and Anne Lennox, married to the Rev. Thomas Drennan. Martha Lennox on her marriage obtained her half; but on her mother's death, claimed and obtained half of her sister's; thus acquiring three-fourths. She and her husband left two sons and five

daughters; but the sons and four daughters having died without lawful issue, their last surviving sister, who also died unmarried, left the whole of her share to Dr. Drennan, who thus became (his mother having also died) entitled to the whole. This property, purchased in 1672 for £50, was sold in 1824 for £22,500, or 450 times the original value in about 150 years. Dr. Drennan's ancestry by his father's side was of an humble class, but on that account so little was known of it, that his eldest sister, born in 1742, declared that she had never known any of her father's family, and she was a woman of remarkable independence of character. Some of Dr. D.'s own tenants in after life, at least one female, bore his name and was perhaps a relative, though she modestly disclaimed any title to be considered one. His grandfather was probably a small farmer, whose ambition it was to bring up a son to the ministry, as is still common in the north of Ireland and Scotland, as is the case also among our Catholic brethren. William Drennan, the subject of this notice, went to school to Matthew Garnet, and entered Glasgow College, 1769; obtained the A.M. degree 1771, studied medicine in Edinburgh College, 1773-1778, where, Sept. 8th, he obtained his M.D. degree. He practised two or three years in Belfast; but not succeeding as he expected, removed to Newry at the end of 1782, where for seven years he exercised his profession with very considerable success, and laid by some hundreds. But, desirous of more extended reputation, he removed to Dublin at the end of 1789, where, as he expresses it, he exercised the duties of an upright man and a strenuous citizen, conceiving them

identified. He beheld the people divided both in and out of parliament into factions, and under the domination of an oligarchy which monopolized all honour, place, and profit. He saw the rural population ejected from their farms, left without resource to indolence and want, with no sure homes, with indifferent morals, and without any bond of union.

Thinking that something should be dared by individual effort for the common good, and hoping to abolish factious contests by an interest for the common weal, he conceived in his mind an intimate union of his fellow citizens in the bonds of virtue and concord. He founded therefore in idea the first society of United Irishmen, and published a prospectus in June, 1791. Arrested subsequently for sedition, he spent a night in prison, with the Bible for his pillow, and narrowly escaped on his trial from the infamy of the informer, who had mingled truth with falsehood, on the 26th June, 1794, but was acquitted. Those who despaired of amendment in the state, a little later rushed headlong to their ruin, appealed to arms, and sought assistance from abroad. The union of the people was broken by the snares of haughtier slaves, the upper classes. Betrayed by those who had figured as flaming patriots, in the grade of generals and colonels of Volunteers, or in lawyers' corps and conventions wherein members of both houses of parliament represented the citizen soldiers of various national associations, the country was lost, and the surrender of her independence as a nation was accomplished in her parliament. Drennan's mind and spirits, though depressed, were not subdued by the calamities which had

fallen on his country. His opinions and principles remained unchanged; he relinquished practice, and removed from Dublin to his native place, having previously married, the 3rd February, 1800.

After Dr. Drennan's return to Belfast, in 1801, he seems to have had no particular object in view, except to conduct the "Belfast Magazine," and to make it instrumental to an object which had taken possession of his mind, namely, that of extending the benefits of education to his townsmen and the province of Ulster. He had felt in his youth the want of a college in his native land, having spent a great part of nine years in pursuing the necessary studies for his profession, and obtaining his degrees in Scotland, and this at an expense which must have pressed heavily on his family's resources. He therefore joined, head, pen, and purse, with the founders of the Belfast Academical Institution, with which his feelings were so much bound up, as to have left a request that his corpse might be staid on its way to the grave for a few moments before its gates. On that spot there now stands a statue, to the memory of an amiable young scion of a noble house. When Belfast is worthy of some memorial of William Drennan, it will have it also; no friend of his fame should wish for it sooner. For his latest years he amused himself with versifying, and translated several shorter poems from the Greek anthology as well as the Electra of Sophocles. But though passages of this translation are highly poetical, as a faithful version it can scarcely be compared with Potter's, or those of later date, Dr. Drennan's acquaintance with Greek being rather that of a gentle-

man, and somewhat rusted, than of a minute grammarian or profound scholar. With Cicero he was more at home, yet even there his style is somewhat unnecessarily diffusive, especially as Cicero says too little. His own style may perhaps occasionally seem somewhat florid, antithetical, and lapsing into alliteration, a fault in the English language not easily avoided.

Having removed from Dublin to Belfast, his native place, in conjunction with Mr. John Templeton, the well-known botanist, and Mr. John Handcock, of Lisburn, Dr. Drennan established, in 1801, the "Belfast Magazine," which ceased to exist in 1814; the most ably-conducted periodical of its day, or indeed of any other day, in Ireland. The papers called "Retrospective Politics" were written by Dr. Drennan and Mr. Handcock. Dr. Drennan died in Belfast in 1820, in his sixty-sixth year, leaving four children, the eldest son a barrister, the youngest a physician, practising in Belfast—the inheritors of much of their father's eminent abilities. The remains of Dr. Drennan are buried in the same church-yard, at the rere of the poor-house, where those of his friend Dr. Haliday repose. A small slab over his grave bears the following inscription:—"Gulielmo Drennan, ob. 5 Feb. 1820, æt. 66 an."

The "Union Star" was set up in Dublin in the summer of 1797, professedly the advocate of the principles and objects of the United Irishmen. Its advocacy, however, was repudiated by the directory of that society, and its atrocious sentiments disclaimed by all its leaders, and es-

pecially, as we are informed in Sampson's Memoirs, by Thomas Addis Emmet. It will be necessary to say a few words respecting Mr. Walter Cox, in reference to the character of this journal, which has brought a very serious imputation on the character of the society of United Irishmen in general, as being the abettors and accomplices of the atrocious crime of assassination.

The following information respecting Walter Cox, I received from his step-daughter, Miss Isabella Powell, who was living in Dublin in 1842.

He was the son of a master-blacksmith in Westmeath, in decent circumstances. His mother belonged to a respectable family of the name of Dease, of Summer Hill in that county. His father held some land, of which he lost possession at the period of Lord Carhampton's wholesale transportation of suspected persons. The old man was one of those arrested by his lordship, and was sent to jail. He was fortunate enough to get liberated after some weeks' imprisonment. He settled in Dublin, and died there in the neighbourhood of the North Strand.

His son, Walter Cox, was bound apprentice to a gunsmith, of the name of Muley, of Suffolk Street, and after remaining three years with him, he served the remainder of his time to another gunsmith, Mr. Benjamin Powell, of 159 Abbey Street, a gun-contractor with the Ordnance department.

On leaving Powell, he set up in business in a small shop in Bedford Row; he had previously married a woman of the Methodist connection, and, being a man of violent and ungovernable passions, he is said to have rendered the life of this poor creature miserable. She died in childbed; and, about the year 1797, he married the widow of his former master, Powell, and for some time carried on the business as gun-contractor with Government. This marriage proved no less unhappy than the former. On one occasion, he was brought before the magistrates for ill-using his wife, at the instance of Mr. Laurence Tighe, of 156 Thomas Street, who was an intimate friend of Mrs. Cox.

Cox got a good deal of property, both in money and in houses, by his second marriage. He had no acquaintance with Laurence Tighe, and no intercourse with Major Sirr; but Mrs. Cox was intimate with the former. He had been deeply engaged in the rebellion of 1798, but not in that of 1803: if he said that he had been in the latter, he must have stated what was not true.

He was separated from his wife upwards of twenty-five years previously to her death. He squandered her means, kept possession of her houses, and allowed her occasionally a small weekly pittance for her support, in a miserable lodging in Clarence Street, North Strand, while in the same street he continued to lead a disreputable life in the house which belonged to her, and in which he resided till the period of his death. The cause of his quarrel with his wife, was by some attributed to an opinion he entertained that his wife, shortly after Emmet's business, had given certain information

to Mr. Tighe (who was said to be a Castle spy), respecting some papers of his, which had got him into trouble, and occasioned his house to be searched by Major Sirr. At the time the "Union Star" was printed, he had a small place of business of some kind in Little Ship Street.

The preceding information of Isabella Powell I believe may be relied on. I visited the house in Clarence Street in 1840, where Cox died. The woman who had lived with him and attended him in his last illness, told me that she frequently heard him speak on the subject of the information which had been given against him in violent and angry terms. This person likewise denies that Cox had any intimacy with Major Sirr, or had taken any part in Emmet's conspiracy. It is right to observe, his enemies state the former as a proof of treachery to his associates of the United Irishmen; and Dr. Drennan alleges that he was in the habit of talking in his customary loose manner of having had the command of 1,500 Wexford men at the Broadstone, the night of Emmet's unsuccessful effort.

With whatever views his infamous paper the "Union Star" was established, it is certain that it was repudiated by the leaders of the United Irishmen, and equally certain that Mr. Cox was the sole editor, proprietor, and publisher of it. Garbled extracts having been given from this

paper in the parliamentary reports, an entire number will be found in the Appendix.

The "Union Star" was printed on one side only, to allow of its being pasted on the walls; the name of its printer and place of publication were not given; its uniform theme was the necessity and justifiability of the removal of public delinquents. Obnoxious persons were pointed out for assassination, and their names regularly published in its columns. The ultra-violence of its revolutionary tendencies were prominently displayed; but its tendency, if not its design, was certainly to bring odium upon the cause it professed to espouse.

Cox went on for some months with perfect impunity, advocating assassination, suggesting the existence of an assassination committee, which never had a being; and all this time he contrived either to elude the vigilance of Government, or to secure its favour. The fact, however, admits of no doubt, that his paper was connived at by the authorities, who were daily denounced in his journal.

The probability is, that when Cox established this paper, he was animated solely by infuriated feelings of resentment for the treatment his father had received at the hands of Lord Carhampton; that finding the chief confidence of the leaders of the United Irishmen placed in other organs of their opinions, namely, those of the

"Press" and the "Northern Star," he became jealous of the patronage bestowed on them, and had suffered himself to be tampered with by some of those official persons with whom his former avocations when in the employment of Powell, the gun-contractor with the Government, had brought him in contact; and that he had become, at first, the confidant of designing men, and perhaps eventually was not unwilling to be accounted their instrument. The fact which I have alluded to of his being found closeted with one of the agents of the Government, at the very period his paper was denouncing and proscribing its members, coupled with the circumstance (which he himself admits), that while the "Press" and the "Northern Star" editors were prosecuted and imprisoned, and their establishments ravaged by the military, the editor of the "Union Star"—the advocate of assassination—was fortunate enough to make terms with the Government, and to save his property from the slightest injury, is inexplicable. It is certain, however, that some years subsequently to the putting down of the rebellion, Cox, on his return from France, considered himself neglected by the Government; and for the purpose of annoying it, in the month of November, 1807, he set up the "Irish Magazine." But, lest any injustice should be done to one no longer living, and one, with all his faults, the Cobbett, on a

small scale, of his day in Ireland—his own explanation of his conduct in the management of the "Union Star" is given here, taken from an article of his in the "Irish Magazine" for October, 1810, addressed to one of his opponents.

You accuse me of being an assassin, because I was the author of the "Union Star." Admitting the charge of proscription to have been fairly brought home to the character of that publication, where will the odium rest, if a fair comparison is made of the "Union Star" and the horrid circumstances that provoked its existence? Perhaps some will insist that emptying our villages into prison ships, a practice very common in the year 1797, was not assassination; putting the people out of the protection of the law, or half hanging them, were not acts of assassination: to me they appear as such; and in the ardent and impatient character of a young mind, roused by a sense of exquisite feeling, at seeing, not only strangers agonizing under the most beastly cruelties, but my aged father swept off with his neighbours, by the hand of Carhampton, into a dungeon, I arrayed myself with those generous sufferers who were taught by the principles of the constitution to resist oppression, and among other acts of my industry to stem the authorized desolation, I produced the "Union Star."

One murder makes a villain, millions a hero; Lords are privileged to kill, and numbers consecrate the crime.

It was intended only to guard the Union against the intrusion of such men as Reynolds or O'Brien.

Laying aside the right of authorship, which I very early assumed in preference to the vise and the anvil, to soothe the agonies of my country, and to avenge the atrocious indignities heaped by a Luttrell on my parent, I defy any man existing, in any rank of life, to fix any act of cowardice, meanness, or dishonesty, on Walter Cox, either as a politician, an author, or a tradesman. I had the honour of enjoying the confidence and intimacy of the greatest and most virtuous men that ever adorned this ill-fated country; and, after a lapse of thirteen years, I possess the esteem of such of them as have escaped the whirlwind of civil desolation. I was tampered with by the terrors of the triangle and the fascinations of the treasury; and I owe nothing either to my friends or my enemies. I escaped being involved in the ruin which overtook the other leaders of the rebellion, by surrendering myself as the author of the "Union Star," with the express advice and direction of my friends, as the proclamation exposed me to a discovery by the extraordinary reward offered for my detection; and I the more readily made terms, as there was not on record a single instance of the "Union Star" having brought the slightest injury on any individual.

I not only enjoyed the confidence of A. O'Connor, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, T. A. Emmet, and Dr. M'Neven, for the character I ever preserved amongst honest men, but was a member of that body whose ambassadors were accredited in the greatest empire upon Earth. Like your friend Mr. Beresford, I represented the City of Dublin in the greatest council of

the nation, where I was placed by fifty times as many electors as all his influence could procure.

So much for Mr. Cox's explanation of his conduct: we now turn to the pages of the "Milesian Gazette" (the rival of Mr. Cox's publication), the editor of which, the well-known Dr. Brenan, charges Cox with having been at a former period in the pay of the government, and a hireling pamphleteer in the service of Major Sirr. He charges Cox with writing a defence of Sirr's conduct on the occasion of his squabble with Emerson for the blood money earned by the capture of Russell. Brenan, at this time, was denounced monthly in Cox's magazine, and was not forgetful how he might turn his injuries to account, or scrupulous as to the means by which he was to be appeased, or the party by whose sacrifice he might be revenged.

In 1804 a pamphlet was published in Dublin, signed "Timothy Tell-truth," in vindication of Major Sirr, whom Mr. John Swift Emerson, an honourable member of the attorneys' corps, had accused of defrauding him of his due proportion of the blood-money, in the case of the apprehension of the unfortunate Thomas Russell, the friend of Tone and the sharer in the desperate enterprise of Robert Emmet. It appears by a pamphlet published in 1804, in defence of

Major Sirr, that he derived his information respecting the place of concealment from Emerson, and Emerson from a third party, who, to use his own words, "did not choose to appear in the business."

Russell was apprehended in the house of a gun-smith, of the name of Muley, in Parliament Street. Mr. Cox was of the same trade, and was employed, subsequently to the rebellion, in the ordnance department in the Castle, as an operative gunsmith. Brenan states, that the third party alluded to by Emerson was Walter Cox; and he also charges him with being the author of the pamphlet in question, and the person who acted as "setter" to Major Sirr on Lord Edward Fitzgerald's removal from Moira House in Dirty Lane, when Sirr failed of success, in consequence of the resistance made by Lord Edward's party.

It is remarkable that Mr. John Swift Emerson was one of the major's party on this occasion, as well as Major Ryan and Mr. Justice Bell.

In Brenan's magazine for June, 1812, in reference to an intimation in Cox's publication, that the betrayer of Lord Edward was Mr. Laurence Tighe, of Thomas Street (who lived within two doors of Murphy's house, where Major Ryan, on being wounded by Lord Edward, it is to be observed, had been immediately taken), the following statement is made:—

Who betrayed Lord Edward, is, as yet, a matter of doubt: the party came upon him in full set; but "Who was the setter dog?" is the question. In the desk of Lord Edward, on the table where he was, was found a paper containing a plan for taking the city of Dublin—a plan upon which Lord Edward was supposed about to act that very night.[1] This paper was in the handwriting of Walter Cox, and he owned it at the Castle, and pleaded having made his peace two years before,[2] on the "Union Star," affairs, as a justification of following up murder with treason; and the Castle folks admitted his plea—and Watty was still let loose. If Lord Edward received a plan of military operations so important from any man, is it not to be supposed he expected and respected his coöperation?—and in that case, is it not almost morally certain he concealed nothing from him, particularly his residence? The commentary is easy. Does not Watty's impunity carry with it the conviction of Castle service? If Watty was false, then, is it to be supposed he did not betray on so great an occasion? That he knew where he (Lord Edward) was, is proved. Russell knew Cox through Lord Edward; and that Watty and the major were close friends at the time, is proved by Watty's own words in the defence of the major, where he says the major told him (the author of the pamphlet signed "Timothy Tell-truth") the whole story the morning after Russell's capture. But Watty then did not imag-

[1] This is not correct: the resolution taken by the Directory in the beginning of May, was that the rising should take place on the 23rd.

[2] This cannot have been the case; the "Union Star" did not exist two years before.

ine that "Timothy Tell-truth" would one day be proved to be no other than the notorious Watty Cox.

Now, in confirmation of that part of the statement, respecting the plan for the taking of Dublin, found in Lord Edward's possession, we find the following remarks on this paper, in the journal of Lady Sarah Napier, in Moore's "Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald," published many years subsequently to the appearance of "Brenan's Magazine":—

The plan referred to was not found at Lord Edward's place of concealment, but in his desk, in the charge of Lady Fitzgerald, immediately after the arrest at Bond's, on the 12th of March.

Lady Sarah Napier, speaking of a visit he received from Captain Armstrong (this gentleman is not to be confounded with the Captain John Warneford Armstrong), says: "From him I heard that the prisoners would come off well, that there was no committee, only some of them assembled about the 'Press'; that the report about a dreadful map in Lady Edward's care, was one of Dublin, with notes written by a clever gunmaker, who had marked the weak parts, and who had sent it to Lord Edward. That, no sooner had this man heard of the noise it made, than he went to government and said it was his, which he had shown to Lord Edward. They asked him for what purpose he had drawn it, 'For my own amusement,' said he." [1]

[1] Vide Moore's "Life of Lord E. Fitzgerald." American edition, vol. ii., p. 23.

At a subsequent period, in a letter from the Duchess of Leinster to the Duke of York, her Grace, in reference to this plan of Dublin, says:

> That paper was found on the 12th of March, and a few days after an armourer, who worked in the Ordnance-yard in the Castle of Dublin, on hearing it talked of, went to the under secretary of state, and desired to see the plan, which, when shown to him, he acknowledged it to be his, and that he had sent it anonymously to Lord Edward Fitzgerald; and being asked his reason for so doing, said, because he understood Lord Edward was a good engineer and curious in those matters. The plan is not mentioned in the Report of the House of Commons, drawn up by Lord Castlereagh, who knew the circumstances.[1]

There are no comments in the work from which I have quoted these passages, on the extraordinary conduct of this "clever gunsmith," this armourer said to be employed in the Castle, at the period he communicated his plan for attacking the capital, in which he had so industriously marked the weak points. The fact seems to have escaped the notice of all those who have written on the affairs of 1798, that the clever gunsmith, the editor of the assassination journal, the "Union Star" and Mr. Walter Cox, the subsequent editor of the "Irish Magazine," were one and the same person. The impunity with

[1] Ibid., vol. ii., p. 197.

which the "Union Star" was allowed to proceed in its atrocious career, and with which Mr. Cox was eventually permitted to acknowledge himself to government its editor and proprietor; the singular step of declaring himself to the under secretary of state to be the framer of that treasonable paper he had given to Lord Edward; the fact of his being enabled immediately after the rebellion, without any resources of his own, to leave the country and remain abroad for nearly a year on that occasion; these circumstances, coupled with the evident tendency of his journal —namely, to bring discredit on the cause he professed to advocate,—render it a very difficult matter to understand the views and conduct of this man: one, in fact, whose mental conformation was the exemplification of all kinds of contradictory qualities, which utterly confound inquiry, and make it well-nigh impossible to form any estimate of the character of so eccentric and singular a person.

It is very difficult to believe that Cox was not in the service of the Castle, and yet there are unquestionable proofs that at the very time he was a frequenter of the public offices at the Castle, and was considered in its service by the authorities, he was even then so far faithful to those of the United Irish leaders he was attached to, as to keep secrets from the government that would implicate them in high treason, and to give timely

and very serviceable notice to those persons, when steps against them were meditated by government.

On the authority of Arthur O'Connor, it was during the period of his imprisonment, in the latter part of the year 1797, the "Union Star" got into circulation. The first thing he did on being set at liberty, was to send for Cox, and to remonstrate with him on the madness of his proceedings. Cox protested that his only object was to frighten the people at the Castle and the Orangemen, and showed, as a proof of his success, that a large reward had been offered for the discovery of the printer and publisher of the "Union Star." Cox states that O'Connor told him he was sure to be discovered, and that his best plan was to go to the Castle, propose to give up the author and proprietor of this prohibited paper, and on making terms, to declare himself to have been the individual.

Cox says he saw the advantage of following this advice. He acted on it, and to the utter astonishment of Mr. Cooke, announced himself as the editor and publisher of the "Union Star." He had the modesty even to claim the reward for his own discovery; however, he was content to have it stipulated that no proceedings should be taken against him, and he should be allowed to remain in Dublin unmolested.

The subordinate agents of government now

looked upon Cox as a rebel, who had made a clean breast of one kind of treason, and was prepared for the entertainment of another. He was closely questioned about his intimacy with O'Connor, and given to understand, that evidence which would go to his conviction, would be very serviceable at that period.

He was examined by Mr. Cooke with respect to his knowledge of O'Connor, and what sentiments he heard expressed by him. Cox replied, that he had never seen Mr. O'Connor but on two occasions, about a pair of pistols which he had sold to that gentleman. He was asked if he knew anything of his political opinions; Cox answered, he only knew them on the subject of pistols, which, he said (much to his surprise), he preferred of English manufacture to that of his own country. Cox was considered unfit for the task intended for him. He discovered that similar inquiries were made of other persons, and he feared the result would be fatal to O'Connor. He visited O'Connor that night, and the information he gave him was such as to induce him to lose no time in making an application to the law officers of the crown to be permitted to go over to London for a few days on some legal business. At this time O'Connor was under heavy recognisances to take his trial for a seditious publication, whenever he should be called upon.

Having obtained permission, he immediately started for England. That he was attended at a respectful distance by some familiar of the Castle, and dogged wherever he went, from the day he quitted Dublin till his arrest at Margate, there can be little doubt. It is due to the memory of Cox, which certainly stands in need of all the justice and charity that can be done to it, to say that Arthur O'Connor is convinced of the fidelity of this man to his associates.

We are informed, by Sampson, of Emmet having taken some steps to restrain the violence of Cox's writings; but neither he nor Sampson appear to have had any idea that Cox had acknowledged himself to government to be the publisher of the "Union Star," and to have made terms for his security. Sampson says, speaking of this paper:

I believe the author never was discovered; some thought it was a stratagem of the government to throw odium on the opposite cause. To me the arguments seemed too strong, and too terribly applicable, to warrant that supposition. I had, upon the subject of these papers, several conversations with Mr. Emmet, who was very zealous in his efforts to restrain them, and, I believe, successful. And what is more, there was found amongst his papers, at his arrest, one drawn up by him and me, and intended to have been subscribed by all whose names could be supposed most influential

amongst the people, which the government, with its usual candour, took care entirely to suppress.

And in a note appended to the above remarks, written long subsequently to the letters which form the greater portion of his Memoirs, he adds:—

It has been lately discovered, by the disclosure of the civil list, that he was pensioned to the amount of £100 a year; and, moreover, it is said that he received a considerable sum on going to the United States.[1]

The pension alluded to by Sampson was conferred on him during the Duke of Richmond's administration, when all other means of silencing his magazine had been found ineffectual, including those of the pillory, and three and a half years' confinement in Newgate.

The "Union Star" was printed in a cellar in Little Ship Street. The whole business of composing and printing was there performed by Cox himself, according to his own account, without any assistance, within a few steps of the Castle. Whether Cox, subsequently to his delivering himself up was considered as entitled to pecuniary assistance, it is hard to say; he was certainly employed in some way in the ordnance department at the Castle. There is a person of his

[1] Of the latter fact the autograph statements of Cox, in my possession, leave no doubt. Sampson's Memoirs, p. 71.

name whose services were occasionally recompensed between 1803 and 1804:

April 7, 1803, Major Sirr for Mr. Cox	£11	7	6
Dec. 25, 1803, Mr. Flint, per Mr. Wickham's note—Cox	68	5	6
Feb. 16, 1804, Mr. Griffith for Serjeant Cox's wife	11	7	6
Jan. 26, 1804, Chaise from Naas, with Fleming, Cox, Keogh, Finnerty, and Condon	3	1	9

From one of the persons who had long been most intimately acquainted and connected with him, and who attended him in his last moments, I received a number of documents, which throw some light on his strange career. About 1804, he went to America, took with him nearly £500, and returned to England in about eleven months, without a sous.

In 1807, he established his "Irish Magazine," a very singular medley of truth and falsehood, blended at random, and tinctured not slightly with the spirit of the "Union Star." It is a performance, however, in which one who is sufficiently acquainted with the subject to discriminate between the reality of his representations of the horrors of 1798, and his exaggerations of them, will find valuable details of the doings, of the O'Briens, Sirrs, Sandys, Swans, Hepenstals, and others of their class, such as he will only ob-

serve glanced at elsewhere, or touched upon with an obvious and natural repugnance.

The pertinacity with which this man stuck to his subject, and bore the brunt of the legal warfare which he had to encounter in the various prosecutions carried on against him, is without a parallel, I believe, in this country. No sooner was he convicted of one libel on the government and the punishment of the pillory, than we find him brought up from Newgate, tried over again for a new libel, sentenced to twelve months' additional imprisonment, fined £300, and called on to give securities, himself in £1000, and two new sureties in £500 each.

At length, an influential gentleman was sent on an amicable mission from the Castle to the cell of the intractable printer in Newgate. Cox was asked if it was his desire to die in jail, or to live at large with a comfortable independence; and if he preferred the latter, he was called on to name the sum on which he could contrive to live, and to relinquish the troublesome task of editing periodicals. This tempting proposal was too much for flesh and blood to withstand—macerated and calmed down a little by upwards of three years of life in Newgate. Poor Cox, to the utter astonishment of the mediator on this occasion, said he thought £100 or £150 a year would not be too much for him to ask. An arrangement was immediately concluded (a sum of £400 in

hand and an annuity of £100); had Cox asked twice the amount, it would have been readily granted to him. In 1816, having placed in the hands of the authorities all the unsold copies of his work, which amounted to 600, he was enabled by government to quit the country, and proceeded to America. In 1817 he established a newspaper at New York, which he called the "Exile," of the same nature as the "Irish Magazine," but more violent in its tone. It commenced the beginning of January, 1817, and died in the spring of 1818. This man's career in America very much resembled that of Cobbett—he began by praising the country—he ended by reviling it, its climate, and its people, in the strongest terms. The pamphlet in which he attacked America, and everything that was American, was published by him in New York, in 1820, under the title of "The Snuff Box;" in point of ability it excelled anything he had written; but with respect to the ferocity of his abuse, it was an out-Coxing even of Cox himself.

By a passport of his in my possession, I find he arrived in Bourdeaux from America in 1821. There he received an intimation from his friends in Ireland, that the discontinuance of his annuity had been a subject of discussion at the Castle. He addressed a characteristic letter on this occasion to a person connected with the government, in which he declared his intention, and

prefaced it with an oath, that "if they stopped his pension he would invade Ireland." The threatened invasion amounted to a menace of his coming back; and in the month of November, his passport was put in order for his return to England by way of Hull. How long it was before he "invaded Ireland" I know not; but he had been quietly domiciled in Dublin for several years, when he received a notification from the Castle, in Dec., 1835, that his annuity would be discontinued from that time.

When he received the notice of the discontinuance of his annual allowance, the sum of £100 was granted to him, to enable him to meet his existing exigencies. He survived this event little better than a year. He died at No. 12 Clarence Street, in very poor circumstances, the 17th January, 1837, in his sixty-seventh year. He had a small house at Finglass, and three or four acres of land, which he bequeathed to a Mr. Crosbie.

Having referred to Dr. Brenan's accusations against Cox, with regard to Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Thomas Russell, it would be an act of injustice to Cox's memory, whose fidelity to his associates Brenan impugns, to conceal the circumstances which render his own statements somewhat doubtful. Brenan had been an early contributor to Cox's magazine: he quarrelled with him and set up a rival periodical. Brenan

like his competitor, was nominally a Roman Catholic: he struck out a new line in satire and censoriousness—a warfare of ridicule on the Roman Catholic leaders of the day, and of ludicrous scurrility against the members of his own profession. It was the interest, and manifestly the object of Brenan, to bring Cox into disrepute, and to establish his own claims on the gratitude of the administration, without incurring the suspicions of his own party.

It would be a folly, indeed, to refer to such matters, if circumstances of far higher public interest were not connected with them. Literature of merit in other countries derives rewards and honours from government; in Ireland, a lampoon has been found sufficient to procure a pension from government. Some doggerel verses, smartly written, turning the most prominent of the Catholic leaders into ridicule, beginning with the words, "Barney, Barney, buck or doe," recommended the writer, Dr. Brenan, to the especial favour of the Duke of Richmond's government. This poor man, of whom it is not only charitable but true to say his wits were partially disordered, on his death-bed, in his wanderings, often repeated incoherent rhymes (for the ruling passion strong in death, prevailed with him), and one couplet not infrequently was repeated, which there is good reason to believe denoted a foregone conclusion:

Barney, Barney, buck or doe,
Has kept me out of Channel Row.

Many pensions, no better earned, have kept men of little worth out of Channel Row poor-house.

Dr. Brenan's "Milesian Magazine, or Irish Monthly Gleaner," is the most perfect specimen that exists in eccentric ephemeral literature of a periodical professing to be a monthly one, setting at defiance all obligations in respect to punctuality, as well as propriety and decorum. Intervals of six, twelve, and eighteen months,—nay, even of years,—occasionally occurred between the appearance of consecutive numbers of this meteoric magazine. The first number appeared in April, 1812; the last—No. 16—in July, 1825. There can be no doubt the mission of the "Milesian Magazine" was a governmental one. The objects to be effected were, to bring Cox and his "Irish Magazine" into disrepute, and the Catholic leaders and the Committee into ridicule.

The first article in the first number is an attack on Cox and his former assassination journal, the "Union Star;" the second is illustrated by an emblematic engraving, representing Cox in the act of killing his wife.

The poetry in the first number consists of the elaborate lampoon, above referred to, on the principal Catholic leaders, Lords Fingal, Gor-

manstown, Southwell, French, Killeen, Kenmare, Netterville, Major Bryan, John Keogh, William Murphy, Silvester Costigan, John Lawless, Owen O'Connor, William Finn, Dr. Drumgoole, and Barney Coile—with the absurd refrain:—

> Barney, Barney, buck or doe,
> Who shall with the petition go?

The labours of Dr. Brenan were duly requited by the representative of the British Government in Ireland. More fortunate than a modern lampooner similarly employed, Brenan was rewarded with a pension of £200 a year—the evidence of which fact, in the handwriting of Dr. Brenan, is in my possession.

Brenan died in July, 1830, in Britain Street, Dublin, aged about sixty-two years. He left two children, a son and a daughter, the latter a lady of a very amiable character, respectably married in Kilkenny. He was born at Ballahide, Carlow; his father was a gentleman of ancient family and once of considerable fortune. He died intestate, leaving six small children, the eldest of whom was John, the subject of this notice. After his father's death, he went to law with his family, and carried on a protracted suit in Chancery against his mother, which brought ruin on the property.[1] His son, however, con-

[1] The property of Dr. Brenan's father, in Carlow alone and its immediate vicinity, called the Castle Hill, at the time of his

trived to get from the wreck of it, between five and six thousand pounds, which he carried with him to England, and having squandered away whatever he possessed, he died there a few years ago. Dr. Brenan was a man of classical attainments of a high order, and very considerable talents, which were most sadly misused by him; he devoted his fine talents to sarcasm and scurrility; the little use he made of his abilities in his profession, was still sufficient to make his name known to medical men, not only in England, but over the continent, as the person who first brought into practice the use of turpentine in puerperal disorders.

Besides the "Press," the other newspapers published in Dublin were, the "Dublin Journal," the "Freeman's Journal," "Saunders's Newsletter," the "Dublin Evening Post," and the "Hibernian Journal."

decease, was worth £200 a year. This and other landed property, Dr. Brenan states, he and his family were swindled out of professionally by his attorneys. The injury he suffered at the hands of these legal gentlemen may account for the incessant warfare he waged on their profession. Brenan's free translations of remarkable passages in classical works of celebrity are deserving of notice:—

"Nemo repentè fuit turpissimus."—"It takes seven years and some hard swearing to make an attorney."

"De mortuis nihil nisi bonum."—"When scoundrels die, all knaves bemoan them."

"Irvitum qui servat idem facit occidente."—

"Cure a man against his willing;
The cure will vex him worse than killing."

The "Dublin Journal," edited by Giffard, was the organ of the government and the faction that swayed its councils. "Saunders's News-letter" professed neutrality in politics, and was chiefly devoted to commercial communications. The "Post" and "Hibernian Journal" were moderate supporters of liberal principles. The amount of literary talent employed in all was extremely small; but in this respect, with the exception of the "Press," the "Dublin Evening Post" excelled all its contemporaries, and in the fidelity and accuracy of its reports of the debates in parliament, it had no equal.

Of the "Dublin Journal," which claimed to be the Government newspaper of that day, a few words may not be found unnecessary.

This paper was originally established by Mr. George Faulkner, one of the aldermen of the city of Dublin, and was ably conducted by him for upwards of fifty years. His house was the rendezvous of the leading parliamentary, literary, and political men of his day. He associated with persons of the highest rank, and was in the habit of entertaining them, it is said, in a style of splendour. Faulkner died in 1775. From the period of his death, this paper gradually declined in spirit and integrity, till its doom was fixed, when its fanatical career commenced, on its coming into the hands of one of the most illiterate and

illiberal men who ever became ambitious of conducting a public journal. This person, Mr. John Giffard, better known by the complimentary *soubriquet* of the "dog in office," was an *alumnus,* it is said, of the Blue Coat Hospital. He was taken by the hand by a person of the name of Thwaites, a brewer, and was brought up to the business of an apothecary. He married a young woman in humble life, in the county of Wexford, and set up as an apothecary in the town of Wexford, but got maltreated in a brawl with a man of the name of Miller in that town, and removed to Dublin, where he set up in the business of an apothecary, in Fishamble Street, in 1771.[1]

In that year, a Mr. John Giffard, a cooper, of Price's Lane, Fleet Street, died in Dublin, but whether a relation or not of the former I cannot say. The following year the name of the Giffard of subsequent notoriety is found in the list of common councilmen. As his prospects brightened, he changed his residence from Fishamble Street to College Street, then to Grafton Street, and finally to Suffolk Street, in 1790. He distinguished himself early for the violence of his

[1] John Giffard's first appearance in print we find in the "Hibernian Journal," from 23rd to 25th October, 1771:—

"Being election day for the Corporation of Apothecaries, Mr. John Pentland, Mary's Abbey, was elected master; and John Giffard, Fishamble Street, and Mr. Thomas Powell, were elected wardens for the year ensuing."

democratic principles, became a member of the Volunteer Association, and declaimed in unmeasured terms against parliamentary corruption, tyranny, and English influence.

Patriotism, however, and the glory acquired in the Volunteer service, brought no money into the pocket of Mr. John Giffard; and in a little time, to the amazement of his friends, he suddenly changed his politics, reviled his former associates, and was duly encouraged and advanced by his new confederates. The first notoriety he acquired, was in the discharge of the humble duties of director of the city watch. In this office he had given some offence to the collegians, and this powerful and lawless body decreed the honours of a public pumping to Mr. John Giffard. As they were in the habit of beating the watch with impunity, and even breaking open houses for the purpose of seizing persons who had offended them, they proceeded to Giffard's house in a tumultous manner, and commenced the demolition of his doors and windows. Giffard manfully defended his house, repulsed his assailants, and shot one of the young rioters in the wrist.

From this time, though Giffard did not throw physic to the dogs, the fortunate dog was himself thrown into office. He filled no particular post or definable situation in the Castle, but was a man of all work of a dirty kind for Govern-

ment—a hanger-on of Clare and the Beresfords.

In the spring of 1790, Giffard's privileged insolence had already reached the acme of its audacity. He attacked Mr. Curran in the streets at noon-day, for alluding in his place in parliament to the large sums of money squandered on the subordinate agents and partisans of administration.

The circumstances of this insult are detailed in a letter of Mr. Curran to the Right Honourable Major Hobart, the secretary, demanding the dismissal of this menial of the Government from a post he then held in the revenue.

"A man of the name of Giffard," writes Curran, "a conductor of your press, a writer for your Government, your notorious agent in the city, your note-taker in the House of Commons, in consequence of some observation that fell from me in that house on your prodigality in rewarding such a man with the public money for such services, had the audacity to come within a few paces of me in the most frequented part of the city, and shake his cane at me in a manner that, notwithstanding his silence, was not to be misunderstood."

Curran, despising the menial, held the master responsible for the insolence of the servant, and a duel between him and Major Hobart was the consequence.

Just previously to the trial of Hamilton

Rowan in 1794 for a seditious libel, it was found necessary to have a jury which could be relied on for a conviction, and a sheriff that could be trusted in such an emergency. Mr. Giffard was therefore made sheriff some months before the trial, "a jury of the right sort" was empannelled, and Hamilton Rowan was sent to Newgate.

Mr. Giffard was at this time, by Lord Clare's patronage and protection, on the high road to preferment under Government, and its countenance had already enabled him to become the chief proprietor of the "Dublin Journal." From the time it came into his hands, its violence, virulence, vulgarity, and mendacity, were of so extreme a character, that in the present day its advocacy would be held detrimental and disgraceful to any party. Yet its editor was patronized and preferred to places of honour and emolument by the administration, and especially favoured with the countenance and confidence of Lord Clare. Indeed, none but the most worthless and unscrupulous men were selected for his lordship's favour.

One of the most signal instances of this man's effrontery was on the occasion of Mr. Grattan's appearance at the hustings in Dublin in 1803, to vote for the then liberal candidate, Sir Jonah Barrington. Mr. Giffard objected to Mr. Grattan's vote, on the alleged ground of his name

having been expunged from the corporation, in consequence of the report of the Secret Committee of the House of Commons, especially got up and revised by Lord Clare, containing the evidence of a man of the name of Hughes (a notorious informer), involving Mr. Grattan in the designs of the United Irishmen. Grattan on this occasion poured forth a volume of invective on the astonished Mr. Giffard; such, perhaps, as never fell on the devoted head of so humble a minion of administration. This memorable burst of disdain and indignation was addressed to his victim in these words:—

> Mr. Sheriff, when I observe the quarter from whence the objection comes, I am not surprised at its being made. It proceeds from the hired traducer of his country, the excommunicated of his fellow-citizens, the regal rebel, the unpunished ruffian, the bigoted agitator. In the city a firebrand; in the court a liar; in the streets a bully; in the field a coward. And so obnoxious is he to the very party he wishes to espouse, that he is only supportable by doing these dirty acts the less vile refuse to execute.

Giffard's reply, as recorded by Sir Jonah Barrington, "I would spit upon him in a desert," is indicative enough of the mind and manners of the discomfited zealot.

In 1798, the "dog in office" discharged the functions of an officer in the Corporation of

Apothecaries, a proprietor and editor of the "Dublin Journal," a surveyor and gauger of the Custom House Quay, a Sheriff's Peer, an Orangeman, an officer of the Grand Lodge, a captain of the City of Dublin Regiment of Militia.[1]

In July, 1799, the gallant Captain John Giffard was tried by court-martial, held in the barracks of Dublin, upon charges brought against the said Captain John Giffard by Major Sankey, of the same regiment. (*Vide* Milliken's Edition of Trial, 1800.) Four charges were brought against the prisoner:—The first, for disrespectful conduct to his commanding officer.

2nd—For neglect of duty and inattention to his company.

3rd—For disobedience of orders.

4th—For scandalous and infamous conduct, unbecoming the character of an officer and a gentleman, in having made a false return of the necessaries wanting to complete his company, and in having directed a serjeant of said regi-

[1] In 1817, the old terrorist of 1798 was still a "dog in office," but only in the Corporation of Apothecaries, as one of the examiners of that body. His military glory had departed. His connection with the excise had terminated in an unpleasant manner. The "Dublin Journal" was defunct: nothing of it remained; but the savage instincts of its Orangeism, its traditions and animosities to the people of Ireland and their faith, found a shrine in a London newspaper—the "Standard"—and a priest for their homage, and a revival of veneration for their intolerance, in the person of a son of Captain John Giffard.

ment to make a false return of the necessaries wanting to complete his said company, particularly under the head of shot, by returning a smaller deficiency than there actually existed, in order thereby to impose on his commanding officer, and to prevent him from knowing that the regimental standing orders, or his own, had not been complied with.

The prisoner pleaded not guilty. He was defended by his son, Counsellor Harding Giffard.

In reply to the second charge, of absenting himself from duty when the regiment was actively engaged against the rebels in the month of May, 1798, Captain Giffard, in his defence, said:—

On the 22nd of May, by leave of General Duff, I came from Limerick to Dublin to see Captain Ryan, my nephew. He was mortally wounded by the dagger of the accursed rebel, Fitzgerald. The day immediately following, my son, Lieutenant Giffard, coming also from Limerick, was savagely murdered at Kildare, because he scorned his life when to be purchased with disgrace. Of this dreadful event I soon heard. I left poor Ryan dying in Dublin, and went to Kildare to cover the mangled remains of my hero. I went singly through that wicked country, and was, of course, fired at through the hedges. I arrived time enough to meet Sir James Duff, and was under him for some time at the Collieries, Monastereven, etc., etc. The army then marched to Baltinglass, on its way to the county Wex-

ford. From Baltinglass I was despatched, with 220 infantry under my command, to steal a march, in the night, through the mountains and through the armies of rebels that occupied them. This is the proudest event of my life. General Dundas and General Duff know that, through good providence, I succeeded, threw myself into Rathdrum, which I fortified in a manner much approved of by every officer who saw it, and thus covered Dublin, and prevented the enemy from turning the left of our wing.[1]—*Magnificabo apostolatum meum.*

This glorification of the captainship of the Dublin apothecary, when he stole a march in the night through the mountains of Wicklow, occupied by armies of rebels, when he threw himself into Rathdrum, and fortified that important place and covered Dublin, and saved our left wing from being turned over by the enemy, is worthy of one of the heroes of Homer. But how superior to Homer's description of similar heroic exploits is Captain John Giffard's "plain, unvarnished tale" of his achievement, let the reader judge. Thus Homer sings:—

Εκλαγξαν δ αρ οϊστοι απ' ωμων χωμηνοιο,
Αυτε κινηθεντος· δδ' ηϊε Νυκτι εοικως.
Εζετ' απειτ' απανευθε νεων, μετα δ ιον ἑηκε,
Δεινη δε κλαγγη γενετ' αργυρεοιο βιοιο.
Ουρηας μεν πρωτον επωθετο, και Κυνας αργες,
Αυταρ επειτ' Αυτοισι βελος εχεπευκες αφιεις
Βαλλ' αιει δι πυραι νεκυων καιοντο θαμειαι.

[1] Report of proceedings of court-martial, p. 52.

"The arrows rattled in his quiver as he moved along in all the fierceness of his wrath. His march was like the night. He took his station at a distance from the foe, and sent forth a shaft; and the sounding of the silver bow was terrible. His first attack was on the animals, the mules and *dogs;* but after that he smote THE ARMY ITSELF with many a deadly arrow, and the funeral piles of the slain blazed frequent through the camp."

Hom. Il., i.

The court-martial found the gallant captain guilty of the first charge, not guilty of the other charges, "and adjudged him to be reprimanded for said offence at such time and place as his Excellency might be pleased to direct."

The majesty of Orangedom was not to be offended in the person of the warlike apothecary, Captain John Giffard. The idea of a court-martial, in 1799, bringing in a verdict of guilty against the proprietor of an Orange journal, on a charge of "scandalous and infamous conduct, unbecoming the character of an officer and a gentleman," was preposterous. "The lucky dog" was accordingly not only acquitted of that charge and two others, imputing neglect of duty and disobedience of orders to the valiant Giffard, but the daring prosecutor, not having the fear of the "Dublin Journal" and Giffard's

Orange patrons before his eyes, was severely censured by the honourable court-martial, as having "originated the three last charges more from pique than from zeal for his Majesty's service."

Nevertheless the court was compelled to find the prisoner guilty of the first charge, and adjudged him to be reprimanded for that offence.

But the power and influence of an Orange partisan of Captain Giffard's pretensions to importance in the state, were not to be disregarded by the Government; and consequently, immediately after the publication of the sentence of the court-martial, Captain Giffard received a letter from the secretary of Lord Cornwallis, addressed to General Craig, with instructions to present it to the General, to the following effect:—

Dublin Castle, 20th August, 1799.

Sir,—I have it in command from the Lord Lieutenant to desire that you will be pleased to reprimand Captain Giffard, of the Dublin Militia, *in a slight manner*, instead of the mode expressed in his Excellency's warrant to you of the 13th instant.

Signed,

E. B. LITTLEHALES.

Lieut.-General Craig, Dublin Barracks.

Thus Orangedom was propitiated by the representative of the sovereign in Ireland, and all superior officers were made to feel that henceforth

all disrespectful conduct on the part of officers under them, who had the advantage of being Orangemen, was only subject to a slight reprimand, by the express command of the Governor-General of Ireland.

The impunity accorded to Orange delinquencies by the Government was exemplified in the preceding year in a still more remarkable manner, by a court-martial sitting in Dublin Barracks, in the case of two soldiers tried for murdering an inoffensive citizen, Mr. Ryan, a skinner, of Watling Street, who was dragged from his own door for daring to look at a party of yeomanry cavalry returning from an execution at Rathcoole, as they passed by his door; and as the military rabble of organized Orangemen, armed by the Government and wearing the king's uniform, were conveying the unfortunate Ryan to the Provost, one of the ruffians, of the name of Tibby, deliberately shot him, and another of this military gang, of the name of Hicks, assisted in despatching the unoffending citizen.

Lord Camden was then viceroy, and Lord Castlereagh the factotum of his administration!!!

General Sarrazin

One of the French Generals who Accompanied the Expedition to Ireland. After a Painting by an Unknown French Artist

CHAPTER III

O'CONNOR'S TRIAL

FROM the time O'Connor became a member of the Leinster Directory of the Society of the United Irishmen, he was the foremost leader in their affairs. When the United Irishmen solicited the intervention of France in 1796, O'Connor negotiated the treaty with the agent of the French Directory. He and Lord Edward had an interview subsequently with Hoche at Frankfort, and arranged the place of landing and consequent military operations.

In the early part of 1797 O'Connor was arrested and committed to the Tower, "vehemently suspected of sundry treasons," rather than charged with any specific crime against the state. After an imprisonment of six months he was liberated. In February, 1798, Arthur O'Connor was in London, about to proceed to France on a mission to the French government from the Leinster Directory of the United Irishmen, the object of which was to press on the French authorities the urgent necessity of hastening the despatch of the promised expedition to Ireland. While O'Connor remained in London he was constantly in the company of Fox and the lead-

ers of the Whig party, frequently a guest of Fox, and in close and confidential communication with him on the state of Ireland, the organization, there is good reason to believe, and the views of the Society of United Irishmen. That Fox was acquainted with the nature of O'Connor's intended mission to France in 1798, the statements of O'Connor and Lord Cloncurry can leave no doubt.

O'Connor's high position in society, his talents, his fortune, and expected large accession to it at the death of his uncle Lord Longueville, together with his uncle's coronet, made him of sufficient consequence to be not only well received, but courted, even in the best circles of London. He was at the height of his popularity there when he took his departure from London on his expedition to France.

On the 27th of February, 1798, the Reverend James Coigly, John Allen, Binns, and Leary, came to Margate. Coigly had adopted the *nom de guerre* of Captain Jones; Allen assumed the character of Coigly's servant; Leary went by his own name, and was the servant of O'Connor. The latter under the name of Colonel Morriss, had arrived at Margate with Binns, who was called Mr. Williams, by another route, the same day. Binns had been previously living with his brother, in London, at the house of the Secretary of the Corresponding Society, No. 14, Plough

Court. Coigly and Allen had been staying in the same house, and O'Connor had lodgings in Strattan Street; but on the night previously to his setting out for France, he slept at the house of Mr. Bell, a merchant, in Charter-house Square.

John Binns had been traced to Canterbury and Whitstable, on the 22nd of February, where he was endeavouring to make arrangements for the hire of a vessel, to convey some friends of his, who were said to be in the smuggling line, to Flushing, or to the coast of France, for which three hundred guineas were asked, and refused by Binns. He then proceeded to Deal, and partly entered into terms for a vessel for sixty or seventy guineas, and then returned to London. This arrangement, however, not having been completed, the parties proceeded to Margate, and, the morning after their arrival there, they were arrested at the King's Head Inn, by Revett and Fugion, two Bow Street officers.

Coigly was at breakfast in a room in which a great-coat was found, with a pocket-book containing several papers, one of which purported to be "An Address of the Secret Committee of England to the Executive Directory of France," stating that "the citizen who now presents their sentiments, was the bearer of them on a former occasion," and concluding with a declaration, that "their only wish was to see the hero of Italy and his invincible legions landed on their coast."

Several Latin papers, certificates of Coigly's studies at foreign universities, were found on him. A passport of Coigly's was found at Binns' lodgings, bearing the signature of the French authorities, in April, 1797. In O'Connor's baggage, a quantity of money, to the amount of £900, was found, a military uniform, and some papers, among them a key to a correspondence with Lord Edward Fitzgerald, found at the residence of the latter, which plainly indicated the purpose of communicating with the French government. The letter found at Lord Edward's contained the following paragraph:—"It is said that Lord Fitzwilliam is going over to Ireland, and great hopes are entertained that he will be able to separate the Catholics from the Union. This you and every good man must endeavour to prevent." The prisoners were conveyed to London, examined before the magistrates at Bow Street and the Privy Council, and finally transmitted to Maidstone jail, to abide their trial at the next assizes.

Monday, May 21st, 1798, James Coigly, Arthur O'Connor, John Binns, John Allen, and Jeremiah Leary, were put upon their trial at Maidstone, before Mr. Justice Buller, Mr. Justice Heath, and Mr. Justice Laurence.[1] An ap-

[1] Lord Eldon, then Attorney-General, assisted by Mitford, afterwards Lord Redesdale, and Garrow, prosecuted in this case; the prisoners were defended by Sir J. Plumer, Dallas, Gurney, Scott, and Cutlar Ferguson.

plication was made to the court by Mr. Plumer, counsel for Messrs. Coigly and O'Connor, founded on an affidavit, setting forth that a magistrate of the county, the Rev. Arthur Young of Dover, had tampered with three of the persons who were called as jurymen; and his own letter to a Mr. Lloyd of Bury (acknowledged to have been written by him), was read to the court, wherein, in referring to three farmers summoned on the jury, he says:

> They are much in my interest, to be sure. I exerted all my influence to convince them how absolutely necessary it is, at the present moment, for the security of the realm, that the felons should swing. I represented to them that the acquittal of Hardy and Co. laid the foundation of the present conspiracy. I urged them, by all possible means in my power, to hang them, through mercy, as a memento to others; that, had the others suffered, the deep-laid conspiracy which is coming to light, would have been necessarily crushed in its infancy. These, with many other arguments I pressed, with a view that they should go into court avowedly determined in their verdict, no matter what the evidence.[1]

The Judges and the Attorney-General, Mr. John Scott (subsequently Lord Eldon), reprobated the act of the reverend gentleman, and the latter said he concurred in the challenge to the three jurymen referred to.

[1] Report of the Trial of O'Connor, Coigly, etc., p. 35.

Revett's evidence on the trial was to the following effect:—He arrested Coigly; there was a dagger found on his person. He was at breakfast; he refused to give his name, or to acknowledge his luggage. There was a great-coat in the room lying on a chair; he would not acknowledge it to be his. The great-coat was taken to another room, and, on searching the pocket of it, the officers found a pocket-book, which Fugion examined, and said it was of great consequence. All the papers were marked, and never out of his possession till they were marked, some in Bow Street, some at the Secretary of State's office. On his cross-examination, he said, after he seized the papers (at the hotel) he did not mark them there; he believed he was desired by the prisoners to take the papers before a magistrate, to have them marked and sealed up. Nobody was in the room when he found them; he had no recollection of the papers being missing after they were brought to Bow Street. Fugion gave similar evidence, but stated that the person who read the paper, when the pocket-book was found, was a Mr. Twopenny. He had heard at Bow Street, the handkerchief which contained the papers was missing. Twopenny swore that he saw the pocket-book taken out of the pocket of the coat while the prisoners were present, but it was then tied up in a handkerchief.

Mr. Frederick Dutton swore that two letters

addressed to a person in Holland were in Coigly's handwriting. He had seen him write his name and the names of others, for the purpose of getting a watch raffled, which belonged to a poor man under sentence of death at Dundalk, where he (Dutton) once resided. The letters in question were dated the 24th and 26th of February. One stated—"Notwithstanding the severe prohibition carried on against our merchandise in France, I am resolved to carry on the trade at all events";—addressed to Mynheer G. F. Vandeleur, Flushing. The other stated—"Being here, and hearing that there is a great seizure of all our merchandise, I write this to inquire about it. If anything may be sent by sea, tell me. As I am under the necessity of attending here as a military man, write to my partner. Direct to Parkinson and Co., Manchester. We are very uneasy about the safety of the last parcel addressed to Mynheer Vanderslang, Amsterdam." Another letter, addressed to Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Mr. Dutton swore was in the handwriting of Coigly. Dutton said he had been a servant, and was a quarter-master in the army since March, 1798. He had been dismissed from the service of a Mr. Carlile; had kept a public house at Newry for some time without a license; never applied to government for any reward, but had applied by letter to Lord Carhampton, soliciting to be made a quar-

ter-master in the army. He had sworn in Ireland against one Lowry, and had previously sworn secrecy to the Society of United Irishmen, which Lowry belonged to, but he had only been sworn on a "Reading made Easy."

Mr. Lane, formerly under-sheriff of the county of Cork, when Mr. O'Connor filled the office of sheriff, identified a letter addressed to Lord Edward Fitzgerald, as being in the handwriting of Mr. O'Connor.

Mr. Ford, one of the Under Secretaries of State for the home department, deposed that he was present when the prisoners were examined before the council. O'Connor objected to his examination being taken down, on the grounds of its incorrectness. Mr. O'Connor's examination before the Privy Council, however, was produced and read. In that examination O'Connor had denied any knowledge of Coigly, or of an intention of going to France.

Revett, the Bow Street officer, produced a book, purporting to be the constitution and test of the Society of United Irishmen. The whole, at the instance of Mr. O'Connor, was read, for the purpose, as he stated, of showing the jury "that it was not possible he could have belonged to a society of such a description as that of the United Irishmen appeared to be, without its being publicly and notoriously known."

The examination of Coigly, signed by him,

before the council, was then read by the Attorney-General, said—"He was no particular profession; declined to answer whether he was in orders; had no particular acquaintance with O'Connor; the examinant was in bad health; was going to Margate; the great-coat, and the paper found in the pocket of it, he knew nothing about; the dagger found on his person he had bought in Capel Street, Dublin. He knew Evans, of Plough Court, but was not aware of his belonging to the Corresponding Society."

Mr. Plumer, as leading counsel for Messrs. O'Connor and Coigly, made a speech, which occupied four hours and a half in the delivery, in the defence (the report says) of both prisoners; but truth obliges me to say, that the defence of the unfortunate priest forms no part of that speech; and the few words that are devoted to the mention of his name, in conjunction with O'Connor's, nominally in his defence, were virtually in the defence of O'Connor, and to the downright prejudice of Coigly. The fault lay with the lawyer, and not with his client, O'Connor. The Lord Advocate of Scotland might truly say, many years after the event, "that man (Coigly) was not properly defended."

Binns was ably defended by Mr. Gurney; Allen, by Mr. Ferguson; and Leary, with considerable earnestness and efficiency, by Mr. Scott (the gentleman who published, about two

years ago, a letter in one of the London newspapers, signed—"A Disciple of John Horne Tooke," in which he asserted the innocence of Coigly, stating that the paper found in his pocket had been put there for a hoax by Dr. Crossfield, a member of the Corresponding Society).

Mr. Stuart, a magistrate in the county of Tyrone, knew Coigly in Dundalk; was aware of his father's house having been wrecked by the Orangemen or Peep-of-Day Boys. Coigly's moral character was good; he (Mr. Stuart) had assisted Coigly lately with money in London.

The Earl of Moira deposed to his having a slight knowledge of Mr. O'Connor; did not feel competent to speak of O'Connor's general character; had only one political conversation with him. The evidence of knowledge, grounded on a single conversation, was objected to by Mr. Garrow.

The Hon. Thomas Erskine deposed to his having known O'Connor three years; his acquaintances in England were people of high rank, with whom he (Mr. E.) acted in parliament. Mr. O'Connor's character was the best any man could possess; he was a man of the strictest honour and integrity, and had made great sacrifices in maintaining the opinions he thought right; he was incapable of treachery to any man, and Mr. E. knew him to possess the highest admiration and regard for the persons

he associated with. He (Mr. E.) was not aware of his having any other connections, or holding any other political principles.

The Hon. Charles James Fox had known O'Connor for three or four years, and frequently conversed with him on political subjects; he lived on intimate terms of esteem and confidence with him, and with the friends of Mr. Fox, who are called the opposition. He (Mr. Fox) always considered him a person well affected to his country, a man highly enlightened and firmly attached to the principles which seated the present family on the throne, to which principles they owed their liberty. He (Mr. Fox) was acquainted with Lord Edward Fitzgerald; he was a near relative of his (Mr. Fox's), and he believed Lord Edward was anxious to go to France, relative to some private affairs concerning his wife, who had property there.

The Earl of Suffolk had known Mr. O'Connor eleven years, and so much admired his political character, that two years ago he introduced him to the Duke of Norfolk, the Bishop of Llandaff, and Serjeant Adair.

The Right Hon. R. B. Sheridan said he had known Mr. O'Connor for three years; he took a deep interest in the affairs of his country, and concerned himself so much about the grievances of Ireland, he seemed to think the people of England had none to complain of. He (Mr.

Sheridan) had advised O'Connor not to remain in this country. O'Connor had said to him, "he would have to form some connections he would not wish to form for the purpose of getting away." He never met any man in his life who more reprobated the idea of any party in this country desiring French assistance.

The Right Hon. Henry Grattan said he had known Mr. O'Connor since 1792; he was formerly a member of the Irish House of Commons. Mr. Grattan never imagined that Mr. O'Connor would favour an invasion of his country.

Lords John Russell, Thanet, and Oxford, and Mr. Whitbread gave testimony pretty nearly similar to the former, as to O'Connor's honourable character and constitutional principles.

Mr. Coigly, at the conclusion of the speech of the Attorney-General, said:

Gentlemen of the jury, it is impossible for me to prove a negative; but it is a duty I owe to you and to myself, solemnly to declare, that I never was the bearer of any message or paper of this kind to France in the course of my life. That paper is not mine: it never belonged to me. It states that it was to be carried by the bearer of the last. This is something which might be proved; but it is impossible for me to prove the negative. There is also an allusion in this paper to secret committees and political societies. I declare that I never attended any political society whatever in Eng-

land. With these considerations, I consign my life to your justice, not doubting but that you will conduct yourselves as English jurymen ever do, and that your verdict will be such as shall receive the approbation of your God.

Mr. O'Connor said he was not desirous of adding a word to what had been so ably said in his defence by his counsel.

Mr. Allen said, he did not think himself called upon to address the jury. He had not seen anything in the evidence tending to criminate him.

Mr. Binns spoke in similar terms; and Leary said: "My lord, they may do what they like with me."

Mr. Justice Buller, in his charge to the jury, leaned heavily against Coigly, throwing out many doubts of a favourable kind to the other prisoners. The jury having retired for about half an hour, returned a verdict of guilty against Coigly, and not guilty against all the other prisoners.

The sentence of death was no sooner pronounced on Coigly, than an unprecedented scene took place in the court. Two Bow Street officers, stationed close to the dock, attempted to seize O'Connor while he was yet standing at the bar. This was prevented by the court, and in a few minutes was again attempted. O'Connor then rushed from the bar into the body of the court;

on which a considerable number of police officers appeared, and the court was thrown into complete confusion. Two swords, which were lying on the table (produced on the trial as part of the property of the prisoners), were drawn by some persons, and people were struck with these weapons. Several persons were knocked down, and the tumult seemed to forebode dangerous consequences.

By this time, O'Connor was seized and dragged back again to the bar; when, silence being restored, he applied to the court for protection, and desired to know by what authority he was seized, being then cleared from all charge by the verdict of the jury. Whereupon the officers produced a warrant, signed by the Duke of Portland, dated so far back as the 22nd of March, for O'Connor's arrest on a charge of high treason. O'Connor, appealing to the court, said: "May I be permitted to say a few words?"

Mr. Justice Buller inquired what he had to say.

O'Connor proceeded—"Will the officers take their hands off? If I am again to be confined, may I not beg the indulgence of being sent to the same place as my brother? I have seen swords drawn upon me after my acquittal in this court. I am not afraid of death. If I am to die, let me die here! Life is not worth preserving on the terms on which I now hold it—

to waste it out in loathsome dungeons. Another confinement will soon be fatal to me." [1]

He was then remanded back into the custody of the jailor. Binns and Allen were liberated the following morning; and Coigly, who, during this extraordinary scene, had stood perfectly calm, and apparently the only unconcerned spectator of it in the court, was removed from the dock to one of the condemned cells in Maidstone jail.

In the first series of this work, it was said to have been stated by A. O'Connor, that the address of an English society, found in the great-

[1] Lord Thanet, Robert Cutlar Ferguson, O'Connor's counsel on the trial at Maidstone, and several others, were tried subsequently, upon an *ex-officio* information, for a riot, in having attempted to rescue O'Connor. Lord Thanet and Ferguson were convicted, fined, and imprisoned. The well-known Walter Cox had gone over to England, with what precise object does not appear, when it was known in Ireland that O'Connor and Coigly were arrested, and were to be tried on a charge of high treason. He was present at Maidstone during the trial, and there is reason to believe, from some mysterious allusions of his, in an account of the trial published in his *Irish Magazine*, that he was not only privy to the attempt made in court to rescue O'Connor at the conclusion of the trial and acquittal of that gentleman, when the latter was arrested on another charge of treason, but that the attempt in question was made, and the arrangements for its execution were organized by him. Cox always spoke of O'Connor as a friend to whom he was devoted; and O'Connor declared to the author that he had entire reliance on his fidelity. Poor Coigly was less fortunately circumstanced than O'Connor. He had only one friend to aid or assist him, or to enable him to make any preparations for his defence. That friend in the time of need and extremity, was the late Lord Cloncurry. He furnished the means liberally for Coigly's defence, and put his friends' generosity in requisition for that humane object. These particulars the author had from Lord Cloncurry's own lips.

coat pocket of Coigly at Margate must have been placed there by the police agents. In a written statement, however, on that subject, in the handwriting of A. O'Connor, now before me, the following account of that affair is given:—

> Though there was no legal evidence to prove that the paper was Coigly's, yet the fact is, it was his, and was found in his riding-coat (pocket); for when the five prisoners were brought to Bow Street, a report was spread that the papers taken on the prisoners were lost. Coigly, for the first time, said it was fortunate the papers were lost, for that there was one in his pocket which would hang them all. He never made a secret to us, his fellow-prisoners, that he had got that paper from a London society. In my memoirs I will clear up this point.

This account corresponds with a statement made to the author by B. P. Binns, the brother of O'Connor's fellow-prisoner, J. Binns, in the material point of the paper having been in the possession of Coigly, and of its having been given to him to convey to France. O'Connor states it was given by a society; Binns says, by Dr. Crossfield, and leaves it to be inferred that Coigly took charge of it, as an ordinary communication, merely to oblige a friend. It is, however, impossible to put this construction upon it. Binns plainly states that Coigly had been the

bearer of a previous communication from England to France, of great political importance, in 1796. The fact of his being the bearer of a former communication, is referred to in the paper found in the pocket of his coat. Binns states the former communications emanated from the Secret Committee of England, composed of delegates from England, Ireland, and Scotland, as a directory. It is, therefore, very difficult to believe that Coigly could be ignorant of the nature of a paper of this description, given him by Crossfield, a gentleman well known to be one of the leading members of a revolutionary society of this period. It is, however, still more difficult to disbelieve the solemn declaration, ascribed to Coigly, of his total ignorance of the existence of this paper, or of his firm persuasion of its having been introduced into his pocket by the police officers.

Coigly was convicted on the specific charge of proceeding to France on a treasonable mission from a secret English society, bearing a treasonable document of which he had a guilty knowledge. This charge was not sustained by any legal proof.

There can be no question but that the evidence did not warrant his conviction. One of the counsel for the crown, Mr. Adam, subsequently Lord Commissioner of the Jury Court of Scotland, declared to Mr. Scott, the counsel for one of the

prisoners, that Coigly had not been properly defended. It would have been too much to have expected from the Lord Commissioner an acknowledgment that a prisoner had been wrongfully convicted.[1]

From the period of O'Connor's acquittal at Maidstone, the 22nd of May, 1798, when he was again arrested in the court on a warrant of the Secretary of the State, issued the previous 22nd of March, in virtue of a bill which suspended the *habeas corpus,* he was kept in durance. After a few days' detention in London, he was transmitted to Ireland, and on his arrival in Ireland, was committed to Newgate, where several of his former associates were then immured. Nearly all the leaders of the Society of United Irishmen were then in the hands of government, several of them under prosecution or already convicted; and within a few weeks after his committal to Newgate, some were executed. At length a compact was entered into between the state prisoners confined in Newgate and Kilmainham, and the government, which originated with a member of the Irish House of Commons, Mr. Francis Dobbs, and, chiefly through the instrumentality of Samuel Neilson, eventually met with the concurrence of all his imprisoned associates, with the exception of Mr. Roger O'Connor and two or three others of minor note. All the par-

[1] *Vide* Letter of Mr. Scott.

ticulars of this compact will be found in the memoir of Samuel Neilson. To stop the further effusion of blood, to save the life especially of one of the members of the Directory, Oliver Bond, who was then under sentence of death, were the chief objects of the parties to the compact, who were members of the Society of United Irishmen. Their own liberation was guaranteed to them; but when liberated they were to quit their country for ever, and to embark for any land they pleased to go that was not at war with England, on the fulfilment of the conditions imposed on them by the government—namely, to reveal the plans and organization of their society, without disclosing, however, the names of parties implicated in the conspiracy. The compact was observed by the state prisoners, but some of its most important obligations were not fulfilled by the government.

CHAPTER IV

EVIDENCE OF ARTHUR O'CONNOR

O'CONNOR'S evidence before the Secret Committees abounds with important information, and throws the fullest light on his political views and those of the society he was connected with. In the parliamentary report, the examinations of O'Connor occupy a single page. In his own report of them, published in London, along with those of Emmet and M'Neven, they occupy twenty-six pages. This authentic report of his is therefore inserted in this memoir:—

EXAMINATION OF A. O'CONNOR BEFORE THE SECRET COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS, AUGUST 9, 1798

Committee.—Were you of the executive of the Irish Union?

O'Connor.—I was a member of the executive from the time I became a member of the Union.

Com.—When did the communication between the Union and France begin?

O'Connor.—You, I suppose, have the report I signed and delivered to the Irish Government, in conjunction with Mr. Emmet and Mr. M'Neven.

[The Chancellor nodded assent; but none of the other members of the committee.]

O'Connor.—In that report you will find the whole of that important transaction detailed. You will there find that the first alliance that was formed between the Union and France was in the middle of 1796. You will see that before the executive entered into any alliance with France, or that it resolved on resistance to the tyranny of the Irish government, a solemn meeting was held, when, after considerng the uniform system of coercion and opposition which had been pursued from 1793 by the Irish government against the Irish people, and finding that 1796 had opened with the sanguinary laws, called the Insurrection and Indemnity Acts, whereby the most sacred rights of the constitution were destroyed, the most gross violations of the laws by the magistrates were indemnified—that the expulsion of 4,000 unoffending inhabitants of the county of Armagh from their homes and properties, left no doubt that all protection was at an end, the executive were decidedly of opinion that, by the principles of the constitution, as established by the Revolution of 1688, they were justified in calling in foreign aid, and in resisting a government which had forfeited all claims to obedience.

Com.—You are under a mistake: the Insurrection and Indemnity Acts were not passed until the end of 1796.

O'Connor.—I am confident I cannot be mistaken, for I know that these acts were what filled up the measure of that oppression which decided the executive to seek foreign aid; and I am confident it did not come to that determination until May, 1796; and I also recollect that I left this country in February, 1796; and

before I left it, the attorney-general had moved these two bills; but if you can have any doubts, your journals will clear them up.

Com.—When did the military organization begin?

O'Connor.—Shortly after the executive had resolved on resistance to the Irish government and on an alliance with France, in May, 1796.

Com.—Were there no communications with France before the middle of 1796?

O'Connor.—None: I can confidently affirm that, until the conduct of the Irish government forced the executive to resist, which was, as I have stated, in the middle of 1796, no alliance whatsoever was formed between the Union and France.

Com.—Did the executive imagine the North would rise if the French landed?

O'Connor.—We had no doubt but the North was sensible of the tyranny of the government, and that they would take the first opportunity to free their country.

Com.—When was the first communication with France after the Bantry Bay expedition?

O'Connor.—I was a close prisoner in the Tower from February, 1797, to August following it. In August I heard of the first communication after the Bantry Bay expedition.

Com.—What did the despatch contain?

O'Connor.—It stated that a considerable force of 15,000 or 20,000 men were embarked at the Texel, and that they would sail in a week.

Com.—What prevented their sailing?

O'Connor.—The wind continued directly contrary

for several weeks after, and the changes which took place on the 14th of September probably had some effect on the expedition.

Com.—Was it mentioned in the despatch where the landing should take place?

O'Connor.—It was not; the directory do not communicate such important intelligence, except to those to whom it may be absolutely necessary.

Com.—Had you any intelligence of the invasion at Bantry Bay?

O'Connor.—There was a messenger who arrived in November, 1796; he said the French would arrive shortly, but did not say where.

Com.—Had you any other intelligence?

O'Connor.—We received a letter about the time of this messenger's arrival (a French agent), which stated that the expedition was postponed: this has never been accounted for.

Com.—Was there a person sent in spring, 1797, to France?

O'Connor.—During the time these messengers were sent off, I was a close prisoner.

Com.—Did you see Dr. M'Neven on his return from France?

O'Connor.—I shall not answer anything about Dr. M'Neven or any other person.

Com.—Oh! he has been here.

O'Connor.—If so, there is the less occasion for you to ask me about him; I shall not answer any questions about any one.

Com.—Did you see any person who returned from France towards the end of 1797?

O'Connor.—I did.

Com.—What intelligence did he bring?

O'Connor.—When he left France, he was assured that assistance would be sent, though no time was mentioned; but so considerable a change had taken place in France on the 4th of September, 1797, and our messenger having left Paris before that period, and not arriving here till after, we did not know what measures the new arrangement might give rise to.

Com.—Have you heard that some conversation on Irish affairs had passed between General Vallence and some persons of this country? [1]

O'Connor.—I cannot conceive that General Vallence could have anything to do with the business; he was an emigrant.

Com.—Was there any connection between the Union and the British and Scotch societies?

O'Connor.—The executive carefully avoided any.

Com.—Was there not some connection between individuals?

O'Connor.—I cannot say what individuals may have done; the executive was careful to confine itself to the affairs of Ireland. As one of the executive, I can say I never had the most distant connection with any British society, nor did I ever interfere with the politics of England.

Com.—Do you know anything of a loan being negotiated with France or Spain?

[1] General Vallence was the son-in-law of Madame de Genlis, was privy to, or implicated in, Dumouriez's treasonable correspondence with the Austrians, and fled from France at the same time Dumouriez went over to the enemy.—R. R. M.

O'Connor.—Some of our agents were ordered to negotiate for £500,000 with either of these powers.

Com.—Was your place in the executive filled up when you left this in January, 1798?

O'Connor.—My place in the executive of Leinster was filled up.

Com.—Were you not proprietor of the "Press"?

O'Connor.—I was until it was destroyed by the Irish government.

Com.—Was it not for the purpose of promoting the Union that you set it up?

O'Connor.—The inculcating union amongst my countrymen was a principal object. I had also in view to expose the outrages and tyranny of the Irish government; but it was not set up by the Union; it was my own individual undertaking; it was under my sole control; and it was set up by me on the broadest basis for the support of the liberties of my country.

A. O'CONNOR'S EXAMINATION BEFORE THE SECRET COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, AUGUST 16, 1798

Com.—Explain the first formation of the alliance between the Irish Union and the French.

O'Connor.—If you have seen the report I signed and delivered, in conjunction with Emmet and M'Neven, it will not be necessary I should go very fully into that important transaction; but if you have not seen it, I will explain it more fully.

Com.—We have not seen the report you allude to.

O'Connor.—Some time in 1795, or the beginning of 1796, a letter was received by the executive of the Union from France, from some individuals of the Union

who had fled from persecution, in which they mentioned that they had made such a representation of the state of Ireland, that they believed the French would be induced to treat with the Union to free us from the tyranny under which we groaned. This letter was not acted upon by the executive at the time it was received, from their unwillingness to have recourse to foreign aid except in the last resort, and in the hope that the effects on the popular mind from the tyrannical measures which government had pursued, would induce them to abandon their measures of coercion, and to adopt measures congenial to the wishes of the people. But the executive saw that the year 1796 opened with the Insurrection Bill,—that four thousand unoffending inhabitants of the county Armagh had been driven from their homes on account of their religious opinions, by a lawless banditti, who were not only not restrained by government, but aided and instigated by its magistracy, and that an act was passed to indemnify the most gross violation of the most sacred laws by the agents and magistrates of government. Roused by these fresh instances of tyranny, the executive of the Union held a most important meeting, to consider the state of the country—to determine on what measures these sanguinary, tyrannical proceedings of government made it necessary for us to adopt. The views and conduct of those who exercised the powers of government, were coolly and dispassionately discussed. The executive were convinced, and the same conviction was in every mind, that a system of monopoly and usurpation had absorbed every part of the constitution which belonged to the people; that those who exer-

cised the assumed right of representing the people of Ireland, were self-constituted; that they acted with the sole view of advancing their individual interests; and that what was called the emancipation of the Irish legislature in 1782, was nothing more than freeing a set of self-constituted individuals from the absolute control of the British legislature, that they might be at liberty to sell themselves to the corrupt control of the British ministry. The executive considered which (party) had the constitution on their side, they who contended that the House of Commons should be filled with the real representatives of the people of Ireland, or those individuals who contended that it should be filled with themselves. This was the great point at issue, by which the past, the present, and future conduct of the Irish government was to be judged, without even appealing to the imprescriptible right of the people to put down oppression. Standing on the ground of the constitution, the executive looked back upon the sanguinary, tyrannical measures which had been invariably pursued by the Irish government and legislature, under the control of the British ministry from 1793; they were convinced that if the most faint connection existed between those who filled the places of the people's representatives and the people, no government or legislature durst commit such unexampled outrages as those which had been perpetrated and indemnified in Ireland; that no lawful or just government could by any possibility be driven to burn houses, or to torture the persons of the people to extort obedience. The executive looked back to the melancholy history of Ireland: they saw how dreadfully it had been

torn and wasted by religious dissensions. The first object of the executive was to destroy religious discord, and promote brotherly love and affection among all the people of Ireland, be their religious belief what it may. The next object of the Union was to promote a reform of the government, and to regain those rights which were the people's birthright by the constitution; yet the oath which bound the people to these first duties of Christianity, morality, and the constitution, was punished with death by the Insurrection Act, which, by some other of its clauses, broke down every barrier of liberty; that not only every effort was made to oppose us in these our exertions to destroy religious discord, but that no means were left untried to organize a sect, founded upon the diabolical oath of extermination, whose institution was avowedly for the purpose of perpetuating religious discord and rancour. This was not all; the expulsion of four thousand Irish citizens, with every aggravation of cruelty and horror, which was followed by the Indemnity Act, left no doubt on the mind of the executive, that all the excesses and outrages were either openly or secretly the acts of the government and legislature of Ireland. Struck with the enormity of these acts and outrages, the executive looked back to the history of James II., and after comparing his conduct with the conduct of the Irish government, which had been beyond comparison more tyrannical and cruel, they were of opinion that if the people were justified in calling in foreign aid to rescue their liberties and constitution from James's government, it was infinitely more justifiable in us to call in foreign aid. The executive were of opinion that the

Irish government had not only forfeited all title to obedience from the people, but that we were called on to resist its most unparalleled usurpation and tyranny; that, as the people of Ireland had been disarmed, contrary to the right of every free people, and as the tyranny under which the government was upheld, was supported by the men and the money of one foreign nation, we stood peculiarly necessitated to seek the aid of some other foreign power. Actuated by this reasoning, the executive sent to seek an alliance with France in May, 1796, which was actually formed in the August following, the first which was formed between the Irish Union and France.

Com.—Did you not go to Hamburg, and afterwards to Switzerland, in the summer of 1796, in company with another person?

O'Connor.—This question points at Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and as it is notorious he did accompany me to Switzerland in 1796, and although my friend is no more, I will not answer anything which could in the most distant manner lead to the disclosure of any act of his. Besides, I am not bound by the stipulation I have entered into for saving the lives of those you have in your power, to disclose any act of my life prior to my becoming a member of the Union; but so little am I inclined to withhold the account of any part of our conduct, and so fully am I convinced of the rectitude of what we have done, that if you will be satisfied with the substance of the transactions of the Union, without leading to names or persons, I will give it.

Com.—Well, we will be content with the substance, without any allusion to names or persons.

O'Connor.—In May, 1796, after the important meeting of the executive I have just mentioned was held, they sent to France to adjust the terms of the alliance, to plan the manner the succours should be seconded, so as to insure success. The most important part of the terms was, that France was to assist Ireland in freeing herself from the tyranny of those who exercised the government of Ireland, and that Ireland should be free to frame whatever constitution she might think fit to adopt. The same expedition which was afterwards equipped and sent to Ireland under Hoche, was agreed on, and everything was settled which could insure success on its landing. At the same time it was proposed to the person who formed this first alliance between France and the Union, that a body should be sent against England to cause a diversion, to retaliate for the Quiberon expedition. To dissuade the French from the invasion of England, this Irish negotiator used every argument in his power. He said, from his knowledge of England, the best men of that country would be most hostile to any interference of the French in the government of their country, on the same just principle that they condemned the interference of England in the government of France; that the situation of Ireland and of England were very different; that in Ireland the people were most solicitous for the aid of France, to rescue them from foreign and domestic tyranny; but that the majority of the people of England would be averse to their interference; that many of the people of England were beginning to see and feel the ruin the ministers had brought on the nation by engaging in the war; but that if they

invaded their country, it would bury all consideration of the injustice of the war under the immediate consideration of self-defence; that it would prove the greatest support to an unpopular ministry, by giving them an unlimited power over the remaining wealth of England in any way they might wish to take it, while a guinea could be extorted. These, together with other arguments, were thought conclusive by those to whom they were addressed, and the invasion of England in 1796 was abandoned.

Com.—Was not M. Barthelemy privy to these transactions?

O'Connor.—I will not answer any question where the name of any person is mentioned.

Com.—But he is a foreigner.

O'Connor.—I care not; the name of a foreigner or a countryman shall be equally inviolable with me.

Com.—Was it not at Paris this first alliance was formed?

O'Connor.—It was not; if it was, you would have no need to ask me the question.

Com.—Was it at Lisle?

O'Connor.—It was not.

Com.—Were you of the executive?

O'Connor.—I was of the executive from the time I became a member of the Union in 1796 until I was obliged to fly my country abruptly in January, 1798, to avoid being taken off by a foul plot which was laid by some of the under-agents of the Irish government, but which my respect for the safety of those who gave me the intimation of it, obliges me to keep secret.

Com.—Inform us of the progress and extent of the organization.

O'Connor.—When I was imprisoned in February, 1797, the organization had made considerable progress in Ulster, and things were in train to extend it to the other three provinces. On my liberation in the August following, I found the means we employed before my imprisonment had been successful in extending the organization, particularly in Leinster; but that it had been thrown into confusion by the burnings, hangings, and torturings, which had been extended from Ulster to the other parts of the country. But to such a degree had the minds of the people been exasperated by the cruelties of the government, the disposition towards the Union was so strong in the three provinces, that in four months after my liberation I was enabled, as one of the northern executive (there being no executive for Leinster during this period), to organize 70,000 men in Leinster only, while the number of those who took the test of the Union was nearly equal to the population of the three provinces. To such a degree did the Irish government raise the resentment of the people against it by the cruelties it practised to support its powers, and to keep down the national spirit for liberty.

Com.—Was not your object in forming the organization to effect a revolution?

O'Connor.—If our mere object had been to effect a revolution, the British ministry and the Irish government were effecting one more violently and rapidly than we wished for. We clearly perceived that the measures they adopted to prevent revolution were the most effectual that could be devised to insure it. When

we view the state of the British empire, we were convinced we need not take much pains merely to make a revolution. If that was our sole object, we knew that the Irish government of itself could not exist one month; we saw that it was the men and the money of England which upheld the Irish government; we therefore looked to the state of Great Britain, and considered the state of its actual government, and we were of opinion that the measures which the present ministry had pursued were the most rapidly ruinous which could be adopted. We examined her state before the war; we thought that as, before the enormous expenditure which the war occasioned, the minister could not extort more than sixteen millions annual revenue, it would be impossible, after hundreds of millions of the national capital had been squandered, that thirty millions annual revenue could by any physical possibility, be extorted, which was the least her peace establishment could amount to. But that, even supposing thirty millions annual revenue could be raised in Great Britain, experience convinced us that liberty must be destroyed by such additional means of corruption being thrown into the hands of the executive; and we were convinced that a nation which had lost her liberty could not long support such monstrous burdens, on the principle that capital, like fluid, would find its level. We were of opinion that as the profits of capital would be higher in France than in England, the vast exhaustion of capital which had taken place in France would be replenished on a peace, by the flowing in of a considerable portion of British capital, and that this disposition on the part of the British capitalist to trans-

port his wealth, would be farther increased by a desire to avoid the enormous taxes to which his industry and his profits would be exposed. These considerations, amongst many others, left no doubt on our minds that the power of England, by which alone the tyranny and usurpation of the Irish government and legislature were supported, must be very shortly destroyed.

Com.—If you did not organize for the purpose of effecting a revolution, what other object had you in view?

O'Connor.—We saw with sorrow the cruelties practised by the Irish government had raised a dreadful spirit of revenge in the hearts of the people; we saw with horror that, to answer their immediate views, the Irish government had renewed the old religious feuds; we were most anxious to have such authority as the organization afforded, constituted to prevent the dreadful transports of popular fury. We hoped that by having committees for each barony, county committees, and provincial committees, by holding out the benefits of the revolution to those who supported it, and by withholding its benefits from those who should disgrace it by popular excesses, we should have been able to restrain the people. But those who had monopolized the whole political power of the constitution, finding that they stood in need of some part of the population, and that, their monopoly being so directly opposite to the interest of all classes of the Irish nation, they could not hope for the support of any (be their religion what it may) on the score of politics, except those in the pay of government; finding how necessary it was to have some part of the population on their side, they

had recourse to the old religious feuds, and set on foot an organization of Protestants, whose fanaticism would not permit them to see they were enlisted under the banners of religion to fight for political usurpation they abhorred. No doubt, by these means you have gained a temporary aid, but by destroying the organization of the Union, and exasperating the great body of the people, you will one day pay dearly for the aid you have derived from this temporary shift.

Com.—Government had nothing to do with the Orange system, nor their oath of extermination.

O'Connor.—You, my lord (Castlereagh), from the station you fill, must be sensible that the executive of any country has it in its power to collect a vast mass of information, and you must know from the secret nature, and the zeal of the Union, that its executive must have the most minute information of every act of the Irish government. As one of the executive, it came to my knowledge that considerable sums of money were expended throughout the nation in endeavouring to extend the Orange system, and that the Orange oath of extermination was administered; when these facts are coupled not only with general immunity, which has been uniformly extended towards all the acts of this infernal association, but the marked encouragement its members have received from government, I find it impossible to exculpate the government from being the parent and protector to these sworn extirpators.

Com.—Were not some of the Union very monarchical?

O'Connor.—My first political acquaintance with the body of my Catholic countrymen, to whom I suppose

you allude, was in 1791, whilst I was high sheriff of the county of Cork, when I defended the Catholics from an attack which was made upon them by the monopolists of our representation in that part of Ireland. At that time the Catholics of Ireland were just beginning to feel the influence of the French Revolution, and to be sensible of the degraded state to which centuries of oppression had reduced them; they were, however, strongly addicted to monarchy, and made their first advances in pursuit of freedom in a very humble manner; but the contempt and insult with which their first petition was scouted from the House of Commons roused them to a sense of their rights as men. In 1792, they again petitioned, but in terms of boldness proportioned to the insult with which their former petition had been treated. They were joined by the Presbyterians; and the contemptuous manner with which both petitions were refused, created a union of sentiment, whereby the Catholics were led to examine what title to power those had who thus insultingly denied the joint desires of the great mass of the Irish nation. They kept aloof from any explanation with the Irish parliament, and negotiated with the British ministry, who they found controlled every act of the government and legislature of Ireland. While the Catholics were succeeding with the British ministry in England, the borough-mongers of Ireland were most active amongst the grand juries in the summer of 1792, in pledging lives and fortunes, never to grant the claims of their Catholic countrymen. When the parliament met in 1793, the mandate came from the British ministry to accede to a partial emancipation of the Catholics. This was not all: in the ses-

sion the House of Commons resolved that the national representation stood in need of reform; they raised the hopes of the Irish but to blast them afterwards. This most impolitic conduct brought the Irish government into the utmost disrepute, and was followed by a declaration on the part of the Catholics in 1793, to stand or fall with their countrymen on the great question of obtaining a national representation. From this time the Irish government seemed to abandon all idea of conciliating the Catholics, and to think only of punishing them for what they thought ingratitude. In pursuance of this plan, all idea of Catholic emancipation and parliamentary reform was scouted; British troops were poured into Ireland, and prosecutions commenced against some of the Catholic and Presbyterian leaders in 1794, on such evidence as clearly demonstrated they were undertaken from vindictive motives of resentment. These measures were calculated to eradicate the inveterate predilection for monarchy from the hearts of the Irish Catholics. In 1795, the British ministry appeared sensible of the consequences which had resulted from the measures which had been pursued hitherto in Ireland; and an attempt was entered on to regain the Catholics by sending Lord Fitzwilliam, with powers to choose his own councils. The hopes of the national mind were raised, particularly of the Catholics; but the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, the abandonment of the projected political changes, the renewal of the reign of terror and coercion, totally alienated the minds of the Catholics from their confirmed propensity to monarchy. No doubt, the French Revolution had a great and powerful effect in exciting the Catholics of Ireland to at-

tain their long lost liberty; but it was the measures of the British ministry and the Irish government, which hurried them into their present violent detestation of monarchy and their present ardent love of representative democracy, which was confirmed in the minds of the very lowest orders, by being familiarized with the organization of the Union, and by observing its good effects.

Com.—Why, what opinion have the lower classes of the people of political subjects?

O'Connor.—The lowest societies of the Union conversed freely of the corruption, and usurpation, and venality of parliament. While I was a member of the House of Commons, you know the frequent conversation among the members was—How much has such a one given for his seat?—From whom did he purchase?—Has not such a one sold his borough?—Has not such a lord bought?—Has not such a peer so many members in this house?—Was not such a member with the Lord Lieutenant's secretary to insist on some greater place or pension?—Did not the secretary refuse it?—Has he not gone into the opposition? These, and such like facts, are as well known to the lowest classes of the Union as to yourselves.

A member of the Com.—Mr. O'Connor is perfectly right; I have heard the lowest classes of the people talk in that style.

O'Connor.—The people are conscious you are self-constituted, and not their delegates; men who have no other object in view but to advance their own individual interests.

A member of the Com.—That we are a parcel of placemen and pensioners?

O'Connor.—Exactly so.

Com.—What is the object the people have in view at present?

O'Connor.—I believe they have laid by for the instant all idea of speculative politics.

Com.—Was there not a disunion in the executive?

O'Connor.—From the time I was elected one of the executive, I never experienced any disagreement.

Com.—Were there not men who could influence the people to disobey the orders of the executive?

O'Connor.—On the contrary, they were always obeyed with the most zealous alacrity. No doubt, the secret manner in which we were obliged to conduct the business of the Union, gave great scope to intrigue; yet I found that wherever religious prejudices were placed in the way of political liberty, the people invariably disregarded the former, and adhered to the latter.

Com.—Did not the executive form a plan of a constitution for Ireland's future government?

O'Connor.—The executive never thought itself invested with power to meddle with the future constitution of Ireland: that could have been the work only of those whom the people of Ireland might elect for that express purpose. We were elected solely to devise means of wresting power out of the hands of men who had violated every part of the constitution and liberties of Ireland, and outraged every feeling and right of man, by the means they employed to retain their usurpation.

Com.—What do you think would tranquillize the people of Ireland, and induce them to give up their arms?

O'Connor.—That is a question which would require the best heart to execute. I am not so ignorant of human nature as to suppose that those men who have so long engrossed the enormous emoluments of ill and unjustly acquired power, will ever restore them to the people, however manifest it must appear to an unprejudiced mind, that the most dreadful ruin awaits the present fruitless effort which is made to retain them.

Com.—But what, in your opinion, would tranquillize Ireland, and induce the people to give up their arms?

O'Connor.—Under the present system of usurpation and corruption, every source by which the Irish nation could acquire wealth is betrayed to Great Britain, and even the wretched pittance her industry gathers is thrown a prey to monopolists of her political power, who have sold her dearest rights. By this double plunder the people of Ireland are destitute, not only of every convenience and comfort of life, but of the bare necessaries to support their existence. If you would tranquillize a people, you must cease to oppress them—you must cease to betray them: make them tranquil. The great and main source from which the wants of a people are supplied, is agriculture; yet near two millions' worth of the rude produce of the agriculture of Ireland is annually exported to pay non-resident landlords; for this there is no return; it is all loss to the Irish nation, and is, of itself, a sufficient drain to impoverish a greater nation for extent than Ireland. The

commerce of Ireland has to cope with the most commercial nation on Earth in its very vicinage, under the disadvantage of a general admission of every species of manufactured and foreign produce on one side, and of an unlimited rejection on the other, with scarcely one exception. When the agricultural produce of a people—when their home and foreign markets are sold, the consequence must be, that they must experience a great dearth of national capital: hence, the best machinery and the most extensive division of labour, by both which labour is so wonderfully abridged, the low profits which result from abundant capital, and the being able to give long credits, are all lost to a nation bereft of every means to acquire wealth. By this cruel injustice, England can supply the people of Ireland with their manufactures (the other great source for acquiring national capital), the same fate is shared by our agriculture, and the abused laws by which the fisheries of Ireland have been destroyed, complete the catastrophe of the ruin of Irish industry, in the several ways of acquiring wealth with which God and nature have endowed her. But this is not all; the small portion of wealth which the Irish nation acquires under these mutilated means, is subject to a thousand of the most gross extortions. A most monstrous establishment (and that for one-tenth of the nation only), under the name of supporting the ministers of religion, but really for the purpose of the most flagrant corruption; a vast military establishment, which those who exercise the powers of government are obliged to keep up, as the sole means by which they can maintain the actual usurpation of all popular and constitutional rights; sinecure

places; pensions; and the various ways which are hourly devised for draining the people. These, if you would tranquillize the people, you must abolish; you must restore to them those means for acquiring wealth which God and nature gave them; you must not subject the wealth they do acquire to any exaction which is not absolutely necessary for the support of a government capable of affording them protection. The result of the pillage which the Irish nation at present undergoes, is, that it diminishes national capital, that wages are low, and employment doubtful—the greatest causes of national misery. The next great evil which results from this great dearth of national capital is, that land has become the only material the people have to work on, which cannot be exported; every one is forced to hire it, as his only means of employment, and the competition has made the rents of lands much higher than they otherwise would be, whilst the tithes (the most impolitic of imposts) are an endless source of vexation and litigation between the people and the ministers of religion. If you would correct all these evils, restore to the Irish nation its just rights; then wealth must flow in from every quarter; thousands of means of exercising industry will present themselves; wages will be liberal; rents will be moderate; and it will be as impossible to disturb the public mind when the reign of justice shall be established, as it will be to tranquillize it, so long as the actual system of usurpation, plunder, and tyranny, shall be continued. It is oppression which has armed the people of Ireland: by justice only you can disarm them. A just government, which emanates from the people, and which exists but for

the people's protection and happiness, need never dread their arms or desire to see them disarmed. As long as you are anxious to disarm the people, so long you have no reason to expect they should be tranquil.

Com.—You have made politics and political economy your study: what political changes do you think would tranquillize Ireland?

O'Connor.—Restore the vital principle of the constitution, which you have destroyed, by restoring to the people the choice of representatives, who shall control the executive by frugal grants of the public money, and by exacting a rigid account of its expenditure. Let the people have representatives they can call friends—men in whom they can place confidence—men they have really chosen—men chosen for such a time, that if they should attempt to betray them, they may speedily have an opportunity of discarding. Give us such a House of Commons, and I will answer for the tranquillity of the country. Place but the public purse in the hands of such representatives, and I will answer for it, the people of Ireland will not have to complain of the profligacy, the tyranny, or usurpation of government or legislators. How such a House of Commons could be chosen (if it was not the interest of those who monopolize the national representation to oppose it), would not be a difficult task to devise.

Com.—Was not the Union to destroy the constitution?

O'Connor.—We could not have an intention of destroying a constitution of which we did not believe there was one particle in existence. A House of Commons, so far chosen by the people, and so far inde-

pendent of the Crown as to control it by its sole exercise of power over the public purse, was the vital principle of the constitution; it was by restraining from time to time this power over the public purse, that those rights, one after another, have been gained, which rights constitute the constitution. The instant such a House of Commons ceased to exist, and that it was supplanted by a House of Commons which represents itself, from that instant the vital principle which created the constitution, and which alone could preserve it from bankruptcy and ruin, was at an end. It was not to destroy this vital principle of the constitution, it was to put down a parliament of self-constituted men, who first destroyed every vestige of the constitution, and then committed every outrage and cruelty to support their usurpation.

Com.—Why, did you not intend to set up a republic?

O'Connor.—I have already told you we did not conceive that any power was vested in us to set up any constitution. We were chosen solely for the purpose of putting down your usurpation of the constitution and liberty of the Irish nation. I know not whether those who would have been chosen by the people of Ireland for the purpose of forming a constitution, would have adopted the constitution you have destroyed. I know not whether it is possible to build up such a constitution, once it has been destroyed. I know not whether they would have formed a constitution purely representative, from a conviction that in an elective government the people, whether by their delegates or in their proper persons, exercise a control over the

government, which I hold to be a republic. As such, the constitution (as long as a House of Commons made any part of it) was a republic; but whether the future government of Ireland may be less, equally, or more democratical than the constitution, those who shall be chosen to frame it can alone determine.

Com.—Was there anything more implied in the oath of the Union than what was set forth in the test?

O'Connor.—Certainly not; for all we wanted was to create a House of Commons which should represent the whole people of Ireland; and for that purpose we strove to dispel all religious distinctions from our political union, and after we had destroyed your usurpation of our national representation, and that we had set up a real representation of the whole people of Ireland, we were convinced there was no evil which such a House of Commons could not reach; we were satisfied that, to set up such a House of Commons was our right, and that whether the other parts of the constitution could stand or not after the House of Commons was restored to the constitution, yet we were assured that our liberties would exist; but that without a constitutional House of Commons, the government must of its own nature speedily end in bankruptcy and ruin, from the vast expense of the corruption and force which it required to uphold it.

Com.—How was the late rising occasioned?

O'Connor.—I have already told you how. From the beginning of the French Revolution, the measures pursued by the British ministry and the Irish government have worked up the minds of the people of Ireland to their present highly irritated state—at one time rais-

ing their hopes, at another time blasting them; at one time promising emancipation and reform, and at another time resisting both with fire and sword, burning houses, hanging, lashing, and torturing; means unjustifiable to support any system, and which a just government could not for one instant stand in need of. These no human patience could endure; and yet (from a conviction that they were practised to goad the people to a premature attempt to put down their oppressors), as long as I could remain, I used every means in my power to endure a little longer; but when, to avoid being despatched, I was forced to fly, those in whose hands the executive power of the Union was vested, yielded to the pressing solicitations of the people of the most oppressed parts, who were desirous to risk their lives in order to rid themselves of the cruelties they hourly experienced.

Com.—Are there not committees forming at the present moment?

O'Connor.—I know not what committees are forming; but I am well assured the people of Ireland will never abandon the Union, and that its principles will never be eradicated from their hearts until we obtain our object.

Com.—How can deputations be sent to France?

O'Connor.—By as many ways as there are human devices.

Com.—Could you get one to go to France now?

O'Connor.—Thousands, if necessary.

Com.—How is that possible?

O'Connor.—Unless you destroy every vestige of commerce, we can find no difficulty in sending to France.

Not a ship that sails, that contains a United Irishman, that does not contain a faithful messenger.

Com.—Do you know anything of the future plans of the French?

O'Connor.—I do not; but I firmly believe they will never abandon their engagements with us.

Com.—Were there many men of property in the Union?

O'Connor.—Men of property usually consult their own personal interests, which is a great check to any generous or disinterested exertion of patriotism; such men seldom run great hazards in the public cause. If we had been content with a hollow support, we might have had abundance of them; however, there were many of considerable property, who upon principle were of the Union.

Com.—Would you not have destroyed the Protestant religion, and the Protestant establishment?

O'Connor.—The destruction of religion is one thing, the destruction of establishments another: the great and just principle upon which the Union is formed is the most perfect freedom for all religions alike. We are of opinion that the monstrous Protestant establishment in Ireland is a grievous burden on Presbyterians, Catholics, Quakers, Protestants,—in short, on all the people of Ireland; highly unjust to those who are not of the Protestant religion, and highly injurious to the Protestant religion itself; for we are convinced it would work a very desirable change in the Protestant clergy of Ireland, if they were made to owe their maintenance to a faithful discharge of their functions, instead of obtaining it by a base and dis-

graceful cringing to patrons; and that if there was no other objection to tithes than their being an endless source of discord between a Christian ministry and the people, they ought to be abolished.

Com.—How did you mean to pay the half million you wished to borrow from France or Spain?

O'Connor.—When the present government can borrow millions on millions, we could have had no difficulty in paying half a million. If millions can be had out of Irish industry by a government which has sacrificed every means of acquiring wealth, we have no doubt a government that restores those rights could easily find means to discharge any debts we should contract in the contest.

Com.—Do you imagine that Ireland could exist as an independent nation?

O'Connor.—I have not a doubt of it. We have five millions of a brave hardy people, and if we had the government in our hands but for a short time to organize and to arm them, we could defy the whole world. Once possessed of a country, they would fight for it; and it is one of the strongest countries in Europe by nature. It must have a tactic peculiar to itself, and the people of Ireland must execute that tactic.

Com.—Could not Great Britain destroy your trade with her navy?

O'Connor.—I doubt if the rest of the world would allow her to shut them out from so good a market. If we were once free, I doubt she could effect it. I doubt she could have power, after the separation of Ireland, to act so injurious a part; but as Ireland has no foreign dominion, and, I trust, never will, if her whole

foreign trade was carried on by foreign ships, it is of little matter. The old notion, that a carrying trade is the most beneficial, is nonsense; the home trade should be the great national object, and that would be most flourishing. There is no convenience nor a comfort of life that we could not find in our island; and the temporary inconvenience and loss we should feel by being obliged for a long time to supply ourselves, would be compensated in a great measure by the hidden resources we should discover.

ARTHUR O'CONNOR.

"Memoir, or Detailed Statement of Origin and Progress of the Irish Union, delivered to the Government by Messrs. Emmet, O'Connor, and M'Neven; together with examinations of these gentlemen," etc., etc. [No printer's name, place, or date. The original authentic edition, printed privately for Emmet, M'Neven, and O'Connor.]

CHAPTER V

O'CONNOR'S IMPRISONMENT

ON the 4th of January, 1799, O'Connor addressed a very remarkable letter to Lord Castlereagh from his prison in Newgate, boldly and eloquently, but passionately and imprudently, it must be added, considering his position, remonstrating with the "young lord" on the breach of faith which he alleged had been committed by the government, indignantly repelling certain statements of Lord Castlereagh in the House of Commons affecting the state prisoners who had been examined before the secret committee, and denying the correctness of the report of those examinations which the government had published.

The result of this explosion was the transmission of twenty of the state prisoners, who were parties to the compact, to Fort George in Scotland; and there O'Connor and his associates remained immured for three years and three months.

The Rev. Dr. Steele Dickson, in his narrative, mentions his disabusing the minds of the king's messengers, who conducted the state prisoners to Fort George, of the idea that the rebellion of 1798 was a Popish insurrection.

Their introduction led to the knowledge that, on the representations in government papers, the Irish insurrection was firmly believed in Scotland to be a real Popish rebellion. One of the gentlemen, who knew that Messrs. Tennent and Simms were Presbyterians, and having learned that I was a minister of that persuasion, in a low voice expressed his surprise that we would be concerned in a Popish rebellion. Overhearing that we would connect ourselves with Papists, and much more this, I interfered, and asked the gentleman, in a voice equally low, why he called the insurrection in Ireland "a Popish rebellion"? He answered pertly, that "he did so on the authority of government, and that it was known to be a fact." I replied that "such an assertion was one of the many falsehoods by which the people of Britain were deceived and misled in respect to Ireland." As this seemed to offend him, I then asked him what opinion he supposed the Irish government to entertain of us twenty, then present. To this he answered rather peevishly, but without reserve, that "they must consider us as the most guilty or the most dangerous, or they would not have distinguished us as they had done." On this, with a view to remove an idea equally unfounded and pernicious, I withdrew to a side-table, and wrotes our names, classed by our religious professions, as underneath:—

PRESBYTERIANS.	CATHOLICS.
William Tennent,	John Sweetman,
Robert Simms,	John Swiney,
Samuel Neilson,	Dr. M'Neven,
George Cuming,	Joseph Cormick.
Joseph Cuthbert,	
Dr. Dickson.	

PROTESTANTS OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF IRELAND.

T. A. Emmet,	Thomas Russell,
R. O'Connor,	Edward Hudson,
A. O'Connor,	Hugh Wilson,
John Chambers,	William Dowdall,
Mat. Dowling,	Robert Hunter.

This done, I returned, and put my little scroll into his hand, whispering, "Please, sir, to look at that; and then tell me what becomes of your Popish rebellion, on your own supposition that government considers us as the most guilty or most dangerous of its enemies?"

While his eyes were intent on the paper, he seemed surprised and perplexed, and on returning it, hinted a suspicion that I was jesting with him. On this I passed it round my fellow-prisoners, asking them, as it circulated, whether I had truly stated their religious professions. This question all answered in the affirmative.

With respect to Arthur O'Connor, Dr. Dickson, in another part of his work, states that O'Connor was not only a Protestant layman, but had been educated for the church, and had been ordained. This statement rests solely, I believe, on the authority of Dr. Dickson; but that it was not made without good grounds, I infer from the upright character of the man, who was known to me in early life, and left a strong impression on my mind of his honesty and sternness of principle.

O'Connor and the other state prisoners embarked on board a vessel of war, sailed from Fort George the 30th day of June, 1802, and were landed the 4th day of July at Cuxhaven, on the coast of Holland. O'Connor went to Paris in September, and was received by the best society of Auteuil, where he sojourned for some time, at the houses of Mme. Helvetius, Cabanis, Tracey, Boufflers, Ginguené, Dannou, Benjamin Constant, Mme. de Stael, and Mme. de Condorcet. He there also made the acquaintance of the first consul, Buonaparte.

On the 4th Ventose, an. XII. (February, 1804), Napoleon appointed him general of division in the French service. His letters of service, which were signed by General Berthier, Minister of War, directed that he was to join the army on the western coast of Brest, where he was to assume the rank of an Irish General Officer, and to command the division of Irishmen. He, in fact, proceeded thither; but dissensions, and conflicting views and interests, and altered designs on the part of the ruling powers in France, led to the abandonment of the projected expedition from Brest. O'Connor only wished for the independence of his country, and insuperable difficulties having arisen as to the means of realising it, he quitted the army and retired from the service.

He then married the only daughter of Con-

dorcet, and turned farmer on the estate of Bignon, which had been that of Mirabeau, and was purchased in 1808. He rendered great services to the country by introducing new methods of cultivation.

When O'Connor was exiled in 1802, his brother Roger was entrusted with the management of his affairs in Ireland. His Irish property was then worth from £1,200 to £1,500 a year. Roger's ideas of property were theoretically those of a communist. He acted practically on those ideas in the discharge of the duties of the trust with which his brother had charged him. He sold portions of his brother's property, and applied the produce of the sales he effected to his own uses, to the extent of about £10,000.

Arthur went to law with his brother, and got a decree against the property of Roger, which eventually brought it to the hammer.

When Arthur visited Ireland in 1834, with the permission of the British Government, he made arrangements for the sale of all his Irish properties, and subsequently they were sold. Nineteen years previously, Madame Condorcet O'Connor was permitted to visit Ireland on the affairs of her husband.[1]

[1] In the "Secret Correspondence" of the Duke of Richmond, during Sir Robert Peel's connection with the Irish government, a letter exists, bearing the signature of R. Peel, addressed to J. Beckett, Esq., dated February 1, 1815, in reply to an application of the wife of Arthur O'Connor, to visit London and to pro-

After Roger's abuse of trust, the general placed his affairs in the hands of his eldest brother, Daniel Connor (who retained the ancient surname of the family, and was ten years older than Arthur). Daniel was residing in Bristol in 1817, and was said to be then worth about £5,000 a year. His eldest son Daniel came over to Ireland, and built a house on that part of the paternal estate which was called Manch. This estate was sold a few years ago in the Incumbered Estates Court, and purchased by Daniel Connor, junior.

The general, in 1807, despatched a confidential agent of his, who had been established at Rouen in a cotton manufactory, to Ireland, to bring his brother to an account, and to rescue the residue of his property. This agent was William Putnam M'Cabe, the active member of the United Irishmen of Belfast, one of the body guard of Lord Edward Fitzgerald in the capital.

On several occasions M'Cabe was sent over from Paris to Ireland by O'Connor, under the name of William Lee. M'Cabe perilled his life each time he came over, for his name was included in the list of fugitives from justice who

ceed to Ireland on affairs of her husband, stating that such leave would be granted. In another letter to the Lord Lieutenant, from the Home Office, London, Lord Sidmouth's views are stated in regard to this permission—namely, that Madame Condorcet O'Connor should be carefully watched while she remained in Ireland.

fled from Ireland in 1798, and by a special act of parliament his return to Ireland was declared a capital offence.[1]

Roger O'Connor's abuse of the confidence placed in him by his brother occasioned the general great embarrassment. In 1807 he was obliged to borow a sum of £4,750 from William Putnam M'Cabe, which debt was not discharged during the lifetime of the leader; and it was only twenty years after that debt had been contracted that a final settlement was effected with the representative of W. P. M'Cabe, six years after the death of the latter, and after protracted legal proceedings of a great many years' duration, first instituted for the recovery of that debt in the beginning of 1809.

[1] An act to prevent persons returning to his Majesty's dominions who have been, or shall be, transported, banished, or exiled, on account of the present rebellion, and to prohibit them from passing into any country at war with his Majesty.—38 Geo. III. ch. 78.

An act to compel certain persons who have been engaged in the late rebellion which hath broken out in this kingdom, to surrender themselves and abide their trials respectively, within a limited time, on pain of being attainted of high treason.—38 Geo. III. ch. 80.

CHAPTER VI

O'CONNOR'S LAST WORK

O'CONNOR'S last and most extensive work is entitled, "Monopoly the Cause of all Evil," by Arthur Condorcet O'Connor, General of Division (in three vols., 8vo, Paris, 1848).

The first and second volumes are devoted to questions of political economy, and legislative power, and principles of government, in theory and practice.

The third volume extends to 605 pages; of these 525 are devoted to polemics, the main object of the author being to prove that all ecclesiastical bodies—"corporate priests," as he designates them throughout his pages—"are arch-enemies of the Christian religion, hypocritical and heathenish."

The poor old gentleman, when he published this farrago of polemical twaddle, was in his eighty-sixth year. I cannot say he was in his dotage, for I saw him within a year of that period, and he was then preparing his work for the press, and he was in the possession of his faculties, in the ordinary sense of these words;

but his ideas on religious subjects, which had always been known to his friends, and to those who were his intimate associates even so early as 1797 and 1798, to be identical with those of the philosopher of Ferney and the disciples of that school, had become less general as far as principles were concerned; they had become individualized; that is to say, the repugnance which he felt formerly to the doctrines of the Christian religion, or the derision of them which he habitually indulged in, had merged into a fierce spirit of animosity to men who were ministers of religion. The "corporate priests" of Europe, and those of France especially, he maintained vehemently, and on all occasions and in all circles, were engaged in a grand Jesuit conspiracy against the liberties of every European people.

This was the poor old general's *cheval de bataille,* which he mounted ever and anon, or rather from which it was impossible to find him dismounted at any hour of the day, at the period I refer to. He rode his hobby, corporate priests, conspiracy of churchmen, and European Jesuit plot, daily almost to death. It was a pitiable spectacle to see a man of such intellectual powers as Arthur O'Connor had been, running amuck in the same ring as that in which Sir Harcourt Lees had allowed his garron of bigotry to ride away with him, galloping over fields of polemics where he showed to no advantage, and flounder-

ing in quagmires and morasses of sectarian strife and bitterness, whence he emerged without credit to his character as a man of deep research, of sober mind, and sound judgment.

O'Connor has devoted his last chapter of his third volume to his connection with the Society of United Irishmen, and a defence, on religious grounds, of that connection, and of his own principles especially, against certain attacks of O'Connell.

O'Connor, in explaining the motives which induced him to become a United Irishman in 1795, and replying to the invectives of O'Connell against him and the leaders in general of the society he belonged to, observes, that when he entered parliament in 1790, the savage penal law was in existence—"a code so tyrannically oppressive that O'Connell could not then have legally exercised the profession of hedge schoolmaster." The extracts given from the third volume of this last work of O'Connor, "Monopoly the Cause of all Evil," convey his reminiscences of the stormy period of his political career. His defence of his conduct and of the United Irishmen, requires to be read, however, by the light of those preceding notices of his peculiar opinions and of his resentments.

On the subject of his connection with the Society of United Irishmen, and the state of Ireland previous to the Union and at the period of

it, we find the following observations in his latest work, indicative enough of talent of the highest order, and of prejudices that disgraced them. We perceive, moreover, ever and anon, the cloven foot of polemics worthy of Tom Paine, creeping on the heels of the politics of O'Connor:—

Bred up in the traditions of my family, I was descended from our ancient chiefs, from my infancy I have been a mere Irishman, without any mixture or alloy. My earliest passion was the history of my country: the more I studied it, the more strongly every energy of my soul was excited to rescue her from the oppression and misery under which she had been suffering during six hundred years. What struck my youthful mind most forcibly, and has afforded me a certain object to fix my aim on, was a passage in Leland's history, where he gives the extract of a letter from Elizabeth's minister to the viceroy in Ireland. Its words are:—"Should we exert ourselves in reducing this country to order and civility, it must soon acquire power, consequence, and riches. The inhabitants will be thus alienated from England; they will cast themselves into the arms of some foreign power, or perhaps erect themselves into an independent and separate state. Let us rather connive at their disorders; for a weak and disordered people never can detach themselves from the Crown of England. . . ." [1]

From 1790 to 1796, that I was a member of the

[1] Leland's "History of Ireland," 1773, vol. ii., p. 291, Ap. O'Connor's "Monopoly," vol. iii., p. 543.

Irish Parliament, all my efforts were directed, by my speechings and writings in and out of Parliament, towards the destruction of the religious disunion which made the force of English power and Irish weakness in Ireland.

In 1793, discontent was so general that the English Government was forced to introduce a law to grant the elective franchise and fair trial by jury to the Catholics.

It was in 1795 Pitt detached the Duke of Portland from the Whigs, by giving him the whole of the patronage of the government of Ireland. In consequence, he named Lord Fitzwilliam to the viceroyship. It is not my intention to enter into the history of this disastrous transaction, by which the perfidy of Pitt has destroyed English domination in Ireland, by rendering government on the English system an impossibility. Acting on this treaty, Lord Fitzwilliam made his conditions before he left England, which were, the power to dismiss some of the most obnoxious men in place, and to grant complete emancipation to the Catholics.

On his arrival in Ireland, he found the carrying those stipulated measures was so pressing that it admitted of no delay. He dismissed Beresford, however, with the load upon the nation of a pension of £3,000 for him, and leaving every soul of his family with places largely paid. Lord Fitzwilliam announced his resolution to support with all the influence of government the total emancipation of the Catholics.

If Pitt had sought, in all the immense powers he exercised at this time, the most efficacious means for impressing on the hearts of the Irish nation the most

indelible repugnance to English rule in their country, the means he employed on this occasion were the most effectual.

After having assented to Lord Fitzwilliam's dismissing Beresford, Wolf, and Toler, and his granting Catholic emancipation—after having let hope arrive at the moment of realization, and the cup was raised to the parched and burning lips of long-suffering Ireland, Pitt dashed it to the ground with the insolence that formed the essence of his character. The moment was critical; I made a last effort to live with England.

Setting aside all consideration of self, of family, of friends, I then threw myself soul and body on the side of my oppressed, insulted, enslaved countrymen, and on the 4th of May, 1795, in the House of Commons of Ireland, after hearing twenty-one speakers, I rose to answer them, when the benches were strewed with snoring members, who soon started up to hear the truths I told them. I warned them that the unexampled insult of the British minister rendered the night's vote decisive for good or for evil. My words were: "If you shall have convinced the people of this country that you are traitors to them and hirelings to the minister of an avaricious, domineering nation, under the outward appearance of a sister country; that the free national constitution for which they were committed, and for which they risked everything dear to them in 1782, has been destroyed by the bribery of the British minister and the unexampled venality of an Irish parliament; if you shall have convinced them that, instead of rising or falling with England, they

are never to rise but when she has been humbled by adversity, and that they must fall when she becomes elated by prosperity; if you shall have convinced the people of this country that, instead of reciprocal advantages, nothing is to be reaped from the connection with England but supremacy and aggrandizement on one side, and a costly venality, injury, insult, degradation, and poverty, on the other, it is human nature that you shall have driven the people of this country to court the alliance of any nation able and willing to break the chains of a bondage not less galling to their feelings than restrictive of their prosperity."

At the same time, I told the men I was addressing, "that if they rejected the emancipation of the Catholics, they would appear to the Irish nation not only as men voting in obedience to the British minister against the voice of the people, but as men voting for an union with England, by which Ireland would be everlastingly reduced to the state of an abject province."

The rotten borough interest carried the question in favour of the British minister against the nation by a majority of seventy-one voices. This blow, dealt with such wanton insult, is the grand epoch in the connection of the two islands; it is the pivot on which the door turns which has shut out English domination from Ireland.

By this act Pitt proved to the Irish nation she should never expect from England other rule than the horrid policy of Queen Elizabeth.

Legislative union was to be the panacea for all the evils; but in this England has helped herself to the

lion's part; and the infamous means by which it was effected damned it in the minds of the Irish.[1] . . .

It was in 1795, after this blow of Pitt's, the union of all Irishmen, which had been a theory, became an existing fact. In Ulster, from this time, the generous spirit of union was propagated with the most active energy by the Protestants, who formed a population which, with the Lowlands of Scotland, was the best informed in all Europe. Each parish had its library, and the excellent journal, the "Northern Star," instructed them and regaled them in their evening's recreation. The Directory, composed of Tennent, the two brothers Simms, Neilson, etc., conducted the Union. I joined them in 1796.

The organization and propagation of union in the other three provinces devolved on my beloved Edward Fitzgerald and me.[2] In those parts of Ireland the grossest ignorance and superstition pervaded the people, except in the towns, marking how unflinchingly the system of Elizabeth for weakening and barbarizing Ireland, had been followed.

I lost not an instant to push the work I had undertaken to its perfection. The mountain barrier I had to remove was the infernal dogma of the Popish religion, which exacts from all its members the belief that every human being who is not a Papist is irrevocably and eternally damned.[3]

[1] "Monopoly," vol. ii., p. 546.

[2] If I do not speak of Lord E. Fitzgerald, it is that he had entire confidence in me, and left me to the executive part. It will appear in my memoirs how noble a part this generous associate took in the union.—"Monopoly," vol. iii., p. 547.

[3] Startled, as I have been over and over, when perusing the

The next greatest evil was the profound ignorance which pervaded the three Popish provinces. I published a state of Ireland in 1796, in which I set forth the causes of her wretchedness and debasement. At the moment I quitted the Irish parliament I had the plan of a law for education prepared. It is thus described in my "State of Ireland:" "The establishment would have been ample to pay for schools in every parish in the nation, where the poor might be instructed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, paying the master for the number of scholars he really taught; also for baronial schools for teaching mathematics, geometry, and such practical sciences as are essential to national industry; county schools for those who had shown genius in the graduate schools; and provincial universities for the highest instruction"—page 19.

I was resolved that the national expense for education should have the preference over every other, and that the glorious monument of the seventh century, when Armagh contained 7,000 students, at a time when all Europe was buried in barbarism, should be reërected in Ireland. It was by teaching my countrymen the

work of O'Connor from which these extracts are taken, at the recurrence in every page, of the foulest slanders, most violent abuse, and reckless outrages on the religion of the great mass of the people of Ireland, I have constantly felt myself impelled to refute or reprobate some odious imputation or monstrous calumny of the writer. But to have done so, I found, would be to append a note to almost every paragraph. The wickedness, however, of the attempt to falsify the faith of Roman Catholics, and to fasten his "infernal dogma" on their religion as one of its tenets, has induced me in this instance to notice and to reprobate the rabid malevolence of a fanatical infidel and a reckless calumniator.—R, R, M,

laws of nature, I would have brought them to the sublime ideas of the true God, with all His attributes, and of the true religion of Christ, which is the republication of these laws of God.

The next cause I assigned for Ireland's misery was the impossibility she was placed in of making the sacred fund that should pay the wages of her productive labourers keep pace with her growing population. What creates in a great measure this impossibility, and entails such a misery on Ireland, is the immense portion of the produce of her labour, which is transported into England to pay the rents of her English absentee proprietors. Much pains have been taken to persuade the Irish that this drain is no loss; nay, I have heard it argued as an advantage; yet, when we come to the fact, it cannot be denied it has the same effect for Ireland as if all the produce she sends to England to pay the rents of English proprietors, who expend every shilling of it in their own country, and not one farthing of it in Ireland, was thrown into the sea; for she would have just as much return in the one case as in the other. Not a shilling of those rents can be converted to the augmenting the capital of Ireland; every shilling of it goes to the augmenting the capital of England. . . .

The last point on which I have to render an account is the part I took in attempting a separation from England. . . .

From 1795, when Pitt had struck the mortal blow to English domination, and the Parliament of Ireland seconded him, I became convinced nothing remained for the real benefit of the two countries but separation.

In this determination I prepared Ireland for carrying it into execution, by uniting all my countrymen into one mind and one resolution; and that it might be effected without bloodshed, I formed an alliance with the executive Directory of France, who deputed the noble-minded General Hoche to make the treaty with me. . . .

It is not in my character to palliate any action of my life by shifting off the responsibility with subterfuges, sophistries, or evasions. I will begin by avowing my acts. If I had erred, I would confess them frankly; but if my conscience tells me I was right, I will support them with their reasons.

When this calumniator of his best benefactors, the United Irishmen (O'Connell), accuses me of being a man of blood, the confounding him and justifying myself lies in all Europe being the witness of my alibi.

I was a prisoner in strict secrecy in the Tower before the rising began, nor did I regain my liberty until years after all was over; and it was known to all the Union that when it was notified to me in the prison of Maidstone, that if I was condemned all Ireland would rise to revenge my death, I sent the most positive commands to forbid it, knowing that such a step could have no other consequence than the shedding of civil blood uselessly. The fact is, Lord Moira came to the British House of Lords on the 26th of March, 1798, demanding to be suffered to produce authentic proofs that ministers had inflicted torture generally on the Irish people, by picketing them until they fainted several times, by cruel floggings and wide-spread burning houses: this was refused by the Lords. As this

was two months before the breaking out of the insurrection, and as these tortures had been exercised during a year and a half before, it is evident the real authors of the insurrection were the ministers who ordered those atrocities. What I did, and what I am responsible for, is the attempt at separation by the joint force of the French expedition and the United Irishmen; and this, if even the troops who entered Bantry Bay had landed, by the declaration of the Chancellor, Lord Clare, in the House of Lords, would have effected separation without a possibility of resistance or a drop of blood being shed. I would never have to begin an attack at a time when all the chiefs were in prison, and that there was not a man capable to command a platoon to direct them.

I know there is scarcely a man in England who will not condemn me for seeking separation; but how many were there in all England sixty years ago who would not condemn the American who should have said, American separation would be a great advantage to the two nations? Yet now who does not know that free trade with twenty millions of an independent nation is more profitable than a trade of stunted monopoly with three millions that existed before the American Revolution? . . .

With all the consummate ability displayed in this masterly production of O'Connor, who can read the preceding violent, revolting, virulent, and unscrupulous invectives of General Arthur O'Connor against Christianity, against the religion of his countrymen, whose cause he vindi-

cated in parliament in 1795, and in the "Press" in 1797 and 1798, against his former political associates of that Church, against his Protestant associates too, with few exceptions, and signally against the best, the most virtuous and single-minded of them all—Thomas Addis Emmet, without lamenting the fatuity of this ill-advised publication of O'Connor's in 1848? I reserve to a more fitting opportunity the vindication of the character of T. A. Emmet from A. O'Connor's malignant and unfounded statements, impugning his courage and his conduct in the directory. In the memoir of T. A. Emmet I will publish a statement of T. A. Emmet, which never yet has been in print, and has remained in my hands eighteen years, in reference to a private quarrel of a very serious nature between him and Mr. O'Connor, which, I have no hesitation in saying, effects the object I have in view—namely, the vindication of Emmet's character from the wicked calumnies of a man of very strong resentments and unscrupulous conduct in acting on them.

In withholding from publication portions of written communications made to me by O'Connor in 1842, I have already stated the motives of consideration for the writer of them, by which I was actuated. My object, when the former edition of this work was published, was to defend Arthur O'Connor in his decrepitude from him-

self. My duty now is to defend his old associates against his egregious self-conceit, jealousy, and dominating headlong passion of animosity to all persons whom he considered competitors for distinction or notoriety in the same cause he was embarked in.

I have known in various countries men who had been eminent theoretical demagogues in early life, or while engaged in maturer age in opposition to unpopular or oppressive governments, who had become in advanced age, or in the enjoyment of power or opulence or pre-eminence in public or professional position, exceedingly arbitrary, tyrannical men, intolerant of all opinions not in accordance with their own; ungenerous and unjust in their dealings with the claims of former associates, and where they could not crush them, apt and eager to depreciate and to discredit their competitors or antagonists: but Arthur O'Connor's equal in these respects I never met.

In 1815 General O'Connor offered his services to Napoleon to defend the independence of France, his new country, against foreign invasion. On the return of the Bourbons, this patriotic offer was the occasion of a letter full of reproaches, addressed to him by the Duke de Feltre, Minister of War, and an Irishman like himself. He was placed on the retired list in 1816, and on the 11th April, 1818, he became a

naturalized Frenchman. By his marriage with the daughter of Condorcet, he had three children, two of whom, young men of great promise, died without issue; the third died on the 26th May, 1851, leaving issue two sons very young.

O'Connor had no desire to return to Ireland to remain there permanently, but he frequently applied for permission to Tory Secretaries of State to obtain a brief sojourn to arrange his affairs in the county of Cork; and it was only under the government of Earl Grey that the required leave was granted, and Arthur O'Connor revisited the altered scene of his early toils and perils. But he had not been long there, when the old faction of Orangeism manifested its ancient malignant instincts. Representations were made respecting O'Connor's presence in Ireland, to the new minister, who had succeeded Earl Grey, of an alarming nature, of the peril occasioned by O'Connor's prolonged sojourn in Ireland; and the Duke of Wellington was weak enough to act on those representations, and to order General O'Connor to quit the country immediately.

The late Mons. Isambert, one of the judges of the Court of Cassation, informed me in a letter on the subject of O'Connor's short sojourn in Ireland in 1834, that when permission was accorded him to visit that country, and to sojourn there for a term of two months, reference was

made to the act 38 George III., chap. 78, which declares, persons who return from transportation, banishment, or exile, on any account of the present rebellion, without permission, are subject to the punishment of death, and prohibits them from passing into any country at war with Great Britain.

Mons. Isambert remarked, he did not see how that law could be considered applicable to the case of O'Connor and the other state prisoners, and he wondered how an Irish act, that had relation wholly to temporary circumstances, could be held to be in force ten years after the general peace.

He observed further (and unfortunately for the character of the magnanimity of our government, with too much truth), "Your governmen keeps up its political resentments longer than ours does."

General O'Connor died at the Chateau de Bignon, on the 25th of April, 1852, in his ninetieth year.

The body of the General, after being embalmed, was buried in the family vault in the park of Bignon. Among the mourners was the late M. Isambert, the eminent legal functionary and judge of the Court of Cassation, one of the oldest and dearest friends of the deceased. Before the tomb was closed, M. Isambert pronounced a brief funeral oration, in which he

warmly eulogized the virtues of the departed general, and enumerated some of his numerous acts of beneficence.

Of the defects in the character of Arthur O'Connor, I have spoken freely. If I have not sought to extenuate them, I am quite sure I have not set down aught in malice. Those who knew him well and were most closely associated with him, entertained the same opinions I have expressed in regard to those defects. If they have erred, I have been led into error by them. But there can be no mistake on their part or on mine as to the opinion that must be formed by all who are conversant with the history of the leaders of the Society of United Irishmen —namely, that among them no man was more sincere in his patriotism, more capable of making great sacrifices for his country, or who brought greater abilities to its cause, than Arthur O'Connor.

MEMOIR OF LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD

CHAPTER I

EARLY CAREER

THE labours of Moore have left very little to be done or desired in the way of justice to the memory of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, as a man singularly amiable, estimable, and loveable, to an extent which it is difficult to find words to describe, or adequately to express a sense of, in any measured terms of admiration. But in regard to Lord Edward's connection with the Society of United Irishmen, his views of the circumstances which led to that connection, the qualities of mind, professional abilities, natural gifts, acquired knowledge, and resources attributable to experience, habits and powers of reflection calculated to form a military leader equal to the emergencies of such a situation as presented itself in 1798—or rather, such a condition as Ireland was reduced to at that disastrous period of governmental abandonment,—much remains to be said and outspoken distinctly and intelligibly, and may be stated within even narrower limits than are assigned to the preceding memoir.

Lord Edward Fitzgerald

From an Engraving by T. A. Dean. After the Original Painting by W. Hamilton, R.A., in the National Gallery, Dublin

The Norman adventurers who overran England in the eleventh century maintained the original characteristic qualities of their vigorous, daring, marauding race, in their new country for upwards of four centuries; but the off-shoots of this stock in the adjacent land, which they began to ravage in 1171, degenerated quickly in the stockade settlements, which they called "the English Pale" in Ireland. Among those, however, who became founders of families, there were some who long retained the old traits of the Norman character, and kept alive the old traditions of the bravery and chivalrous spirit of their rude ancestors. Individual adventurers from the French province adjacent to Normandy and the northern parts of Italy had made common cause with the Norman bands, and were to be found among the marauders of their name who passed over from England to Ireland.

The Giraldi of Florence and Ferrara carried over with them the qualities for which they were renowned in Italy, as formidable leaders, partisans, or *condottièri;* but gradually the Giraldi became hardly recognizable in the Irish Geraldines, and in the last century there were few traces of the manly character, vigorous minds, and active energies of the first settlers in Ireland discoverable in their descendants the earls of Kildare. In 1798, the last indication of the stirring energies of the old race, attracted notice

for a brief space, and then suddenly, the meteor of a moment disappeared.

The young patriot soldier of the house of Leinster, fifth son of James, the twentieth Earl of Kildare, who stepped into the arena of a great struggle for the independence of his country in 1798, revived the recollection of the old Geraldines in their best days; and when he perished, nothing of them was left but a name and another mournful episode in Irish history.

The following account of James, twentieth Earl of Kildare and first Duke of Leinster, is taken from the very rare work entitled, "The Earls of Kildare and their Ancestors, from 1057 to 1773" (1 vol., 8vo., p. 304. Dublin, 1857,) thus described in the fly-leaf:—"The following notices of the Fitzgeralds of Kildare have been collected from the historical works in the libraries of Carton and Kilkea.[1]

(Signed) "KILDARE."

James, the twentieth Earl of Kildare and first Duke of Leinster, was born the 29th May, 1722. In 1747, he married Lady Emily Mary Lennox, second daughter of the second Duke of Richmond, and sister of Lady Holland, Lady Louisa Connolly, and Lady Sarah Napier. He died the 19th November, 1773, in Leinster House,[2] and was buried in Christ Church (in

[1] The impression of the above-named unpublished work by the Marquis of Kildare, was limited to twenty-five copies.

[2] In 1744, the family residence of the Kildare branch of the

the immediate vicinity, be it remembered, of Werburgh's Church, where the remains of his fifth son were deposited in 1798, temporarily, as it was then designed they should be). The Duchess of Leinster survived the Duke many years, and remarried William Ogilvie, Esq., by whom she had two daughters—Cecilia Margaret, married to Charles Beauclerc, Esq. The duchess died the 27th March, 1814.

Issue of James, Duke of Leinster, by his marriage with Lady Emily Mary Lennox, nine sons and ten daughters:—

1. George, Earl of Orkney, born in 1748; died in 1765.

2. William Robert (second duke), born in Arlington Row, London, 1749; married the only daughter and heiress of Lord St. George in 1775; died the 20th October, 1804, the duchess having pre-deceased him on the 23rd June, 1798.

3. Caroline Elizabeth Mabel, Lady, born 1750; died 1754.

4. Emily Maria Margaret, Lady, born in 1752; married Lord Bellamont; died in 1818.

Geraldines was in Suffolk Street. The Earl soon after his accession set about providing a new and more suitable mansion for his family and his successors. "Molesworth Fields," then unoccupied, was selected for a site for "Kildare House," afterwards called "Leinster House," the foundation of which was laid in 1745.

5. Henrietta Catherine, Lady, born 1753; died 1763.

6. Caroline, Lady, born in 1755; died the same year.

7. Charles James, Lord, born 1756; entered the navy, attained the rank of rear-admiral; created Baron Lecale; died in 1810.

8. Charlotte Mary Gertrude, Lady, born 1758; married J. H. Strutt, Esq., M.P.; created Baroness Rayleigh; died in 1836.

9. Louisa Bridget, Lady, born in 1760; died 1765.

10. Henry, Lord, born 1761; married, in 1791, Charlotte, Baroness de Ross; died in 1829.

11. Sophia Mary, Lady, born 1762; died 1845.

12. Edward, Lord, born 15th October, 1763 (of whom more hereafter).

13. Robert Stephen, Lord, born in 1765; married Charlotte, daughter of C. Fielding, R.N.; entered the diplomatic service; was minister in Switzerland, Denmark, and Portugal.

"In 1798, being at Copenhagen, he offered an asylum in the English embassy to his brother, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, but at the same time sent in his resignation, which, however, George III., on hearing of the circumstances, refused to accept saying that 'a good brother could not

be a bad minister.'"[1] He was elected M.P. for Kildare in 1804; died in 1833.

14. Gerald, Lord, born in 1766, entered the Royal Navy, and was lost at sea in the Gulf of Florida in 1788.

15. Augustus Joseph, Lord, born in 1767; died in 1771.

16. Fanny Charlotte Elizabeth, Lady, born in 1770; died in 1775.

17. Lucy Anne, Lady, born in 1771; married in 1802 Admiral Sir Thomas Foley; died in 1851.

18. Louisa, Lady, born and died in 1772.

19. George Lennox, Lord, born in 1773; died in 1783.

Of Lord Edward, of whom mention is made above, the Marquis of Kildare says:—

He succeeded to the estate of Kilrush, in the county of Kildare. He entered the army in 1780, and served with distinction in America. In 1783 he was elected M.P. for Athy, and in 1790, for the county of Kildare. In that year, refusing to support the government measures, he was informed he would not be permitted to have the rank of lieutenant-colonel. On this he took the cockade from his hat, and dashing it to the ground, trampled upon it. In 1792, he went to France, where in December he married Pamela Sims,

[1] "The Earls of Kildare and their Ancestors," by the Marquis of Kildare, p. 280.

said to be the daughter of Madame de Genlis. Whilst there he was dismissed from the army. In 1796, he joined the United Irishmen, and having been arrested on the 19th May, 1798, he died of his wounds in Newgate prison on the 4th of June. He had one son and two daughters. After his death, he was attainted by act of parliament, and his estate forfeited and sold. This act was repealed by a private act in 1819.

This notice is sufficiently compendious for a "peerage," and almost succinct enough for a tombstone; but some millions of people, more or less, on either side of the Atlantic, will think something more remains to be said of "the Geraldine" who died for his country in 1798.

Lord Edward lost his father at the age of ten years, and it would seem as if that loss had contributed to concentrate all his love on his mother; for, certainly, few instances in the biography of any country are to be found of stronger attachment and more devoted filial fondness than he displayed from boyhood, undiminished by advancing years, and to the end of his career. The Duchess of Leinster, soon after her marriage with Mr. Ogilvie, went with her husband and several of her children to France.

The young Lord Edward, when he accompanied his mother to France, was under sixteen years of age. He was intended for the military profession; and from the period of his arrival

in France, his education, which Mr. Ogilvie took charge of, was chiefly directed to the acquisition of knowledge that would qualify him for his future pursuit. In 1779, the family returned to England, and soon after Lord Edward commenced his military career in a militia regiment, of which his uncle, the Duke of Richmond, was colonel. In 1780, he was appointed to a lieutenancy in the 26th regiment of foot, then stationed in the south of Ireland. Soon after he had joined his regiment at Youghal, an exchange was effected for him into the 19th, which was under orders for America; and in the month of June, 1781, he sailed for Charleston, where Lord Rawdon was then in command.

From the time Lord Edward commenced his military career in America, the love of his profession, and the necessity of making himself master of it, are themes of frequent recurrence in his letters. Not long after his arrival in America, in 1781, when serving with his regiment (the 19th), he distinguished himself in an engagement with the forces of one of the ablest American commanders, Colonel Lee, not only by his bravery but his military skill, in a manner to attract the special notice of Major Doyle (subsequently General Sir John Doyle), and to obtain for him the appointment of aid-de-camp on Lord Rawdon's staff, in which position he soon had an opportunity of displaying his

chivalrous valour, and of gaining the entire confidence of his superior officers. A little later we find the acting adjutant-general recording an act of undisciplined valour of "the brave young creature," whom he had to "rate soundly" at the moment, and to represent to the general in chief command, in terms anything but unfavourable to the gallant young officer:—

In approaching one of the English positions, the enemy's light troops in advance became more numerous, and rendered more frequent patrols necessary. Major Doyle was setting out upon a patrol, and went to apprise Lord Edward, who, however, was sought for in vain, and the major proceeded without him, and at the end of two miles, when emerging from the forest, the latter found Lord Edward engaged with two of the enemy's irregular horse. He had wounded one of his opponents when his sword broke in the middle, and he must have soon fallen in the unequal struggle, had not his enemies fled on perceiving the head of Sir John Doyle's column.

The higher Lord Edward advanced in his profession, the more he thought it incumbent on him to apply himself to the study of it. In March, 1783, he writes from St. Lucia:—

"My profession is that of a military man; and I would reproach myself hereafter if I thought I lost any opportunity of improving

myself in it, did I not at all times do as much as lay in my power to merit the promotion I am entitled to expect," etc.

In the beginning of 1783, he visited the islands of Martinique and St. Lucia; and Lord Rawdon having previously returned to England in consequence of ill health, Lord Edward a few months later, finding his only hope for promotion was in Europe, and that if he were at home he might obtain a company in the Guards, or a lieutenant-colonelcy by going to the East Indies, determined on returning to Ireland, which purpose he carried into execution in the summer of 1783.

It was Lord Edward's destiny to visit America during the war of independence, to witness some of the stormy scenes of the struggle, and to find ample food for reflection in the successful resistance of a people asserting their liberty, and the many difficulties and signal discomfiture of the royal forces under renowned generals, which had been experienced even during the short period of his sojourn in America.

Soon after his arrival in Ireland, in the autumn of 1783, he was brought into parliament by his brother the Duke of Leinster, for the borough of Athy.

When Lord Edward returned to Europe from America in 1783, he brought over a Negro servant, who is frequently mentioned in the

letters of his kind master as "the faithful Tony." This Negro was, probably, first met with at St. Lucia by Lord Edward, which island he had visited on service in the month of February of that year. During the remaining fifteen years of his life, Tony continued in his service, accompanying his master wherever he went, devotedly attached to him, and Lord Edward's regard for "the faithful Tony" appears to have been no less sincere.

When Lord Edward resided in Ireland, chiefly at Frescati, in 1784 and 1785; in Woolwich, 1786; Spain and Portugal in 1787; Halifax and New Brunswick in 1788; Quebec and Montreal in 1789; and was again in Ireland, either in Leinster House, Kildare Street, or at Frescati, in 1790 and 1791; in Paris and Dublin in 1792; again at Frescati in 1793; at Mr. Connolly's lodge, in the town of Kildare, to which Lord Edward removed from Frescati in June, 1794; and had his abode at Leinster House, or Castletown, or Carton, in 1795, 1796, and 1797, "the faithful Tony" was never separated from his master. He accompanied him to Canada; and in the fatal year of 1798, we hear of Lady Fitzgerald, on the disappearance of Lord Edward from Leinster House, after the arrests at Bond's, in March, removing to a house in Denzille Street, and taking with her "her husband's favourite Tony"; and then no more mention is

made of this faithful creature during the life of Lord Edward; and we find one brief reference to him at the conclusion of Moore's "Life and Death of Lord Edward Fitzgerald":—

"Poor Tony, of whose fate the reader must be desirous to know something, never held up his head after his noble master's death, and very soon after followed him."

In the spring of 1786, Lord Edward (at that time a member of the Irish House of Commons) determined on entering himself at Woolwich, with the view of making himself thoroughly acquainted with military science by a regular course of study. This resolution of a young nobleman in his position, surrounded by all the allurements of fashionable society, courted by political parties as a member of parliament, on account of his brother's influence and his own popular manners and address, reflects no small credit on his character, and indicates plainly his strong attachment to his profession, and sense of the obligations imposed on him to deserve preferment in it. Of this dominant idea we find ample proofs in his letters from the age of seventeen on France, when we find the occupation of his boyhood was almost exclusively, "in all things that related to science in military construction, the laying out of camps, fortifications, etc., in which he was early a student and proficient."

In 1786, we find Lord Edward accompanying his uncle, the Duke of Richmond, on a tour of inspection of the islands of Guernsey and Jersey, and making a good use of the opportunities for improvement afforded him.

In 1787, Lord Edward visited Gibraltar, and under the pretext of a tour of pleasure, carried into effect his real purpose of extending his military knowledge.

While Lord Edward was at Gibraltar, by a strange coincidence, the man by whose hand he was destined eleven years later to lose his life, Henry Charles Sirr, was in that garrison, where he states he knew Lord Edward. The fact is thus referred to by Sirr in a letter dated 29th December, 1829, to the son of Captain Ryan, who met his death at the hands of Lord Edward in 1798: "I agree with you relative to Lord Edward. He was considered a highly honourable man at Gibraltar, where I knew him when he was on a visit to the governor of that garrison."

This fact, which had been so long kept in the background by the major, is a new feather in the cap of his celebrity. That former acquaintance with a man whom he knew to be so highly honourable, and consequently shot so coolly and with such deliberate aim, enhances, of course, the merit of that act of stern duty and stoic loyalty, the capture and death of Lord Edward Fitzgerald.

From Gibraltar Lord Edward proceeded to Lisbon, where his popular manners, and that valuable accompaniment of such advantages, his sterling merits, gained for him a warm reception and the friendship of the principal people of that capital and its court during a long sojourn there. From Portugal he proceeded to Spain, visited Madrid, Cadiz, Grenada, and other places of interest, but hastened back to England, weary of inactivity, and longing for the occupations of that military life to which he was so strongly attached. Towards the latter end of May, 1788, he sailed for America, for the purpose of joining his then regiment, the 54th, which was then in Nova Scotia, and from the latter end of June to May, 1789, he remained on service, stationed at intervals in New Brunswick, Halifax, Quebec, and Montreal.

In August, 1789, he writes from New Brunswick: "I grow fonder of my profession the more I see of it, and like being major much better than being lieutenant-colonel, for I only execute the commands of others."

A little later: "I have got a garden for the soldiers, which employs me a great deal. I flatter myself next year that it will furnish the men with great quantities of vegetables, which will be of great service to them."

In Cobbett's "Advice to the Young," we find a passage to the following effect: "I got my

discharge from the army by the great kindness of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, who was then major of my regiment."

Cobbett was a serjeant-major of the 54th at the time of this occurrence, in October, 1788. He states elsewhere that in the year 1800 he told Mr. Pitt what he thought of that meritorious officer: "Lord Edward was a most humane and excellent man, and the only really honest officer he ever knew in the army."

In April, 1789, he set out on an arduous expedition with his servant Tony and a brother officer from Frederickstown, in New Brunswick, to Quebec—an expedition of considerable difficulty—through an unexplored country, through forests and morasses, but one calculated to be of great advantage to the colony. They accomplished the journey in twenty-six days, lying out, of course, at night in the woods, without any covering except their blanket-coats. They steered by compass, and entered the River St. Laurence within a league of Quebec. The journey was accomplished in 175 miles, the route before travelled being at least 375 miles.

So much for the energy and enterprise of the young Irish officer in his twenty-sixth year. In June, 1789, Lord Edward's intercourse with the native Indians led to a singular adventure at Detroit, and an unprecedented honour to an English officer at the hands of an Indian chief,

one of the Six Nations, by whom he was made a chief of the Bear Tribe.

Early in December he arrived at New Orleans, and finding it impracticable to pursue an intended journey into Spanish America, he embarked for Europe, and in due time reached England.

In the wilds of America and in the forests of Canada we find Lord Edward, after the fashion of Jacques, descanting on the advantages of "this life, more sweet than that of painted pomp,"—"more free from peril than the envious court," which in the woods

> Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
> Sermons in stones, and good in everything.

He wanders in the woods of Canada, and exults in their solitudes, and travels through great tracts of country peopled only at wide intervals by Indian tribes, the simplicity of whose mode of life fills him with delight, or settlers widely scattered, in whose humble dwellings he finds peace and happiness, and is thankfully reminded by everything around him, "There are no devilish politics here."

There are several references in Lord Edward's letters to an attachment of a very ardent nature formed in 1785 or 1786, to Lady Catherine Mead, second daughter of the Earl of Clanwilliam, who, a few years subsequently (in

1789), married Richard, fourth Viscount Powerscourt. But long before that occurrence, we find Lord Edward's passion for this lady had subsided, and another and a stronger one had got possession of his heart. Its new idol was a Miss G——; but the young lady's father decidedly opposed the union, and eventually even forbid Lord Edward his house, and in the month of April, 1789, the young lady had become the wife of another. The disappointment of Lord Edward's hopes appears to have made a deep impression on his mind and heart, and probably had no small influence over his future career and the new direction given to his thoughts and pursuits.

When Lord Edward received the intelligence of the last-mentioned marriage, he was in Canada, on his second visit to the New World. He returned to England early in 1790. Moore states, on his arrival in London, he proceeded immediately to the house of his mother, who was then residing there, and by the merest accident was spared a meeting that could not fail to be distressing. He arrived at the house the moment that a large party had seated themselves at dinner, "among whom were the young bride of the preceding April and her lord," and was only prevented from entering the room by one of the guests, who recognized Lord Edward's voice and hastened to stop him.

May there not be some confusion here, and the young bride referred to have been the Lady Catherine Mead, who married Lord Powerscourt, the 20th of June, 1789?[1] The supposition would be the more probable, as the bride's family and her husband were both on terms of intimate acquaintance with the Duchess of Leinster; and the treatment which her son had received at the hands of the father of the other young lady was likely to have put an end to any intercourse with her or her family, from the time of the rejection of Lord Edward's suit.

Relations of a mysterious nature between members of the Leinster and Powerscourt families previously to the birth of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, had a kind of shadowy existence in the minds of some old collectors and dispensers of folk-lore at the close of the last century, which renders the occurrence of the name of a member of the Wingfield family in connection with the marriage of a lady who had engaged the affections of Lord Edward Fitzgerald noticeable. The young nobleman of the Wingfield family, the fourth Viscount Powerscourt, who married Lady Catherine Mead, was nearly of the same age as Lord Edward; the latter was born in 1762; Richard, third Viscount Powerscourt, to whom Lord Edward is said to have borne a strong resemblance, died in 1788. In his will,

[1] See "Lodge's Peerage."

it is confidently stated that he bequeathed to Lord Edward Fitzgerald the sum of £10,000.

I have examined this will of Richard, third Viscount Powerscourt, in the Prerogative Court, Dublin, which is dated July, 1788, and a codicil to it the month following, and not one word is to be found in either testamentary document respecting Lord Edward Fitzgerald from beginning to end. So much for the value of gossiping genealogical relations.

CHAPTER II

PARLIAMENTARY CAREER

WHEN Lord Edward was brought into parliament by his brother, the Duke of Leinster, in 1783, for the borough of Athy, he was then in his twenty-first year, one of the purest minded of human beings, young, ardent, generous, of a lofty spirit, single-minded, and brave-hearted, incapable of harbouring a sentiment that was mean, sordid, or selfish, or giving expression to a thought that did not emanate from a strong, earnest, unalterable conviction of the truth, right, and justice of the opinion he asserted, the side he espoused, or any principle on which he acted.

We learn without surprise that Lord Edward felt no pleasure in his parliamentary life. What atmosphere in this world could be more uncongenial to the nature of a being of such purity, than that tainted one of the Irish House of Commons, that reeked with corruption, whose vitiated condition seemed to be essential to the existence of the boroughmongers' power, and the vile purposes for which that parliament was constituted?

By the Irish parliamentary debates I find that

Lord Edward Fitzgerald made his *debut* in the Irish House of Commons for the borough of Athy after the general election in July, 1783. The first time that he spoke in the house, or at least that any observations of his are reported in the "Parliamentary Register," was in January, 1785, on a motion of the Hon. Thomas Pakenham to present an address to the king of thanks for the appointment of the new Lord Lieutenant, when Lord Edward is reported to have said—"he would not object to the address if it had proceeded in the usual mode, as a mere complimentary matter of form; but when it declared an approbation of the firm and moderate measures of his Grace's government—measures in which he could not coincide—he felt himself under the necessity of opposing that part of the address. He therefore moved that the words 'experienced virtue and firmness,' should be expunged, and the words 'and whose private virtues entitle him to the esteem and regard of this house,' should be inserted in their room."

Lord Edward, in one of his letters, previously to his second expedition to America, thus speaks of his party in the Irish House of Commons:—

"When one has any great object to carry, one must expect disappointments, and not be diverted from one's object by them, or even appear to mind them. I therefore say to everybody, that I think we are going on well. The

truth is, the people one has to do with are a bad set. I mean the whole; for really I believe those we act with are the best."

Bad, indeed, were the best of that Whig party "as a whole," with whom poor Lord Edward had to do in 1787, and for ten years later. But, like a good, brave man, devoted as he was to a cause he thought good, and well knowing how its interests alone can be upheld, he tells his mother that, even to one of his best and most intimate friends (Mr. Ogilvie), "even to him I put on a good face, and try to appear not disappointed or dispirited."

In the latter part of 1786 and beginning of 1787, Lord Edward's name is found in all divisions in the House of Commons, invariably on the side of his country, in favour of all measures that were tolerant, just, and liberal; that is to say, on the side that was always worsted in the Irish parliament in those times. There is an expression of Lord Edward's, in a letter of his in 1787, which deserves attention as one of the earliest evidences of the impression made on his mind of the hopelessness of effecting any good in that parliament for his country, or for that liberal cause in England, which he considered identified with the interests of the Whig party in Ireland. In February, 1787, he writes:—

"I have been greatly disappointed about politics, though not dispirited. We came over so

sanguine from England, that one feels the disappointment the more."

The 13th of March, 1787, Mr. Grattan's motion on tithes being under discussion, Lord Edward Fitzgerald said, "that tithes having for thirty years been considered as a hardship and matter of grievance, it became the wisdom of the house to inquire into them. While the people were quiet, no inquiry was made; while they were outrageous, no inquiry, perhaps, ought to be made; but certainly it was not beneath the dignity of the house to say that an inquiry should be made when the people returned to peace and obedience again."

In 1788, the Duke of Leinster having promised to give his support to the new viceroy, Lord Buckinghamshire, voted with the government; and as a matter of course in the Irish parliament, when the patron of a borough changed sides, his member was expected to walk over to whatever side he supported. Lord Edward disapproved of his brother's change, and resolved to remain in opposition. His uncle, the Duke of Richmond, however, prevailed on him, reluctantly to give up his intention of voting with the opposition, without reference to the Duke of Leinster's wishes. Family considerations, in November, 1788, were sufficient so far to influence Lord Edward in the course taken by him; but interested motives had no share in the result of the inter-

ference of the powerful Duke of Richmond. Though hitherto desirous of promotion in his service, he determined from that time forth to seek no promotion at the hands of the Duke of Richmond, and to abstain from accepting a lieutenant-colonelcy or any other step, lest his actions as a member of parliament might be biassed by any such motives as a desire for promotion.

"I am contented with my rank and station. I have no ambition for rank; and however I might be flattered by getting on, it will never pay me for a blush for my actions. The feeling of shame is what I never could bear."

He takes care to have a friend informed, who was then taking steps to obtain a lieutenant-colonelcy for him, that he will accept of no preferment.

"Pray represent it strongly to him, and make him remember how obstinate I am when I once take a resolution." But Lord Edward's embarrassment was soon removed by the return of the Duke of Leinster to the opposition, when the famous question of the regency was first mooted.

In the spring of 1790, when Lord Edward returned from America to England, on his arrival in London he visited his uncle, the Duke of Richmond, who was then master-general of the ordnance, and was invited by the duke to meet Mr. Pitt and Dundas at dinner, to talk over matters connected with the military information he had

gained in America, in relation to the Spanish colonies, and during his journey in Spain, previous to his departure for Canada, respecting the fortresses he had visited in that country. The result of that interview was so favourable an impression of Lord Edward's military talents on Pitt and his colleague, that they offered immediately to promote him by brevet, and give him the command of the expedition that had been determined on against Cadiz. The flattering offer was promptly accepted. The duke, on the following day, was to report the proposed arrangement to the king, and to be enabled to state that Lord Edward was no longer in opposition to the ministry.

The Irish parliament, which terminated on the 5th of April, 1790, had been either recently expired, or was about to expire. Lord Edward had declared his intention henceforward to devote himself solely to his profession. The day following this arrangement, Lord Edward found that the Duke of Leinster had returned him for the county of Kildare. His position being thus altered, the difficulties of his recent engagement were communicated to the Duke of Richmond, but not before the latter had made known to the king the proposed arrangement, and the condition which accompanied it. The result of this *contretemps* was an altercation between the duke and his nephew, and a decided refusal on the

part of the latter to desert the opposition, and the relinquishment, as a matter of course, of the command which had been offered to him.

This proceeding of Lord Edward, which led to an estrangement with the Duke of Richmond, enhanced his merits in the estimation of Fox and the leaders of the Whig party in England; and it had the effect also, unfortunately, of turning all his thoughts to politics.

Charles Lennox, third Duke of Richmond, was born in 1735. He passed through the several inferior grades in the army, to the rank of general, in 1782. He filled several of the highest offices in the state. He was one of the principal secretaries of state in 1766; master-general of the ordnance in 1782. He married, in 1757, a daughter of the Earl of Aylesbury. He had two sisters by his father's first marriage: 1. Lady Georgina Caroline, married to the Right Honourable Henry Fox, afterwards Lord Holland. 2. Lady Amelia, first married to James, Earl of Kildare, afterwards Duke of Leinster; and secondly, to William Ogilvie, Esq. By his father's second marriage with a daughter of the Marquess of Lothian, he had four sisters, of whom two are connected with the subject of this memoir: 1. Lady Louisa Augusta, born the 24th of November, 1743, married, in 1758, to the Right Honourable Thomas Connolly, of Castletown, county Kildare, in Ireland. 2. Lady Sarah,

born on the 14th of February, 1745; married, in 1762, to Sir Thomas Charles Bunbury, Bart.; and secondly, in 1781, to the Hon. George Napier.

In the seventh session of the parliament which met the 21st January, and terminated the 5th of May, 1790, Lord Edward Fitzgerald having ceased to be the representative of the borough of Athy, was returned for the county of Kildare, and continued to represent that county for six years.[1]

In December, 1792, a body of the old Volunteers, associated under the name of the First National Battalion, publicly announced their intention of assembling in Dublin, and parading publicly on an appointed day. The device of this corps was an Irish harp without a crown, surmounted by the Cap of Liberty. The government issued a proclamation forbidding the assemblage the day preceding the appointed meet-

[1] In the new parliament, which assembled the 2nd of July, 1790, the members for the county of Kildare were Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Maurice B. St. Leger Keatinge; for the borough of Athy, Lieutenant-Colonel A. Ormsby and Frederic John Falkener, Esq.; for the borough of Kildare, Vernon Digby, Esq., and Robert Graydon, Esq.; for the borough of Naas, Lord Naas and James Bond, Esq.; for the borough of Harristown, Sir Fitzgerald Aylmer and Arthur Burdett, Esq. The Honourable Charles Fitzgerald, who had represented the county of Kildare in the previous parliament, was returned for the borough of Cavan; and Lord Henry Fitzgerald, who had represented the borough of Kildare in the former parliament, sat in the new one for the city of Dublin, his colleague being Henry Grattan, Esq.

ing. The parliament was called on to ratify this proclamation. On this occasion Mr. Grattan supported the government in issuing their proclamation; Lord Edward Fitzgerald, with more consistency, but less discretion perhaps, indignantly opposed that measure. He said with much vehemence: "I give my most hearty disapprobation to this address; for I do think that the Lord Lieutenant and the majority of this house are the worst subjects the king has." A storm of no ordinary violence was the result. The virtuous ministerial party, the constitutional Beresfords, Tolers, Trenches, and Tottenhams, indignantly exclaimed: "To the bar! take down his words!" Every one in the house shouted more or less, and became vehement and agitated, with one exception, and that was Lord Edward Fitzgerald. The house was cleared, and the storm raged in the cleared house for some hours after the clearance, and divers unsuccessful attempts were made to get a satisfactory explanation from the contumelious lord; but all that could be effected was *une excuse pire que le delit.* The "Parliamentary Register" does not report it; but the questionable apology is said to have amounted simply to an admission that "he had spoken what had been taken down; t'was true, and he was sorry for it."

"The house," says the "Parliamentary Register," "resolved *nem. con.* that the excuse of-

fered by the Right Honourable Edward Fitzgerald, commonly called Lord Edward, for the words so spoken, is unsatisfactory and insufficient.

"Ordered—That Lord Edward do attend at the bar to-morrow."

The following day his lordship attended at the bar of the house, made some kind of an apology, which evidently was no apology at all, for it is not reported in the "Parliamentary Register," when a division taking place, "the apology was accepted by 135 votes in favour of it, 55 votes being only against its acceptance."

On the 6th of February, 1793, the Arms and Gunpowder Bill being gone into in committee, Lord Edward said, "that the clause imposing penalties on the removal of arms from one place to another, was an infringement on the liberty of the subject. He was informed by gentlemen of administration that the Defenders were now in arms. In case of an attack upon his house, would he not be allowed arms without license, for its defence? Must Volunteers apply for a license to the Lord Lieutenant, his secretary, or the Commissioners of the Revenue, as the bill requires, as often as they wish to go through their evolutions? He therefore voted against this clause particularly, and considered the entire bill a penal one."

In the debate on the Insurrection Act, pro-

ductive of such calamitous results, in reference to the resolution of the house connected with that measure, Lord Edward said:

I shall oppose this resolution, because I think that this resolution will not prevent the crimes of which the right honourable gentleman complains. The disturbances of the country, sir, are not to be remedied by any coercive measures, however strong; such measures will tend rather to exasperate than to remove the evil. Nothing, sir, can effect this, and restore tranquillity to the country, but a serious, a candid endeavour of government and of this house to redress the grievances of the people. Redress these, and the people will return to their allegiance and their duty; suffer them to continue, and neither your resolutions nor your bills will have any effect. I shall therefore, sir, oppose not only this resolution, but all the resolutions which the right honourable gentleman has read to you, except perhaps one—that which goes to constitute the written testimony of a dying witness good evidence. This, I think, is fair, and likely to facilitate the course of justice, without violently infringing, as all the other resolutions seem to do, the liberty of the subject.

Lord Edward was not at the time of this debate, nor for a long time after, a United Irishman.

July 19, 1794, speaking of Irish parliamentary affairs, Lord Edward says:

I know if he (the Duke of Leinster) goes over to

the ministry, I shall *not* go with him; for my obstinacy or perseverance grows stronger every day, and all the events that have passed, and are passing, but convince me more and more, that these two countries must see very strong changes, and *cannot* come to good unless they do.

Lord Edward Fitzgerald, on the occasion of the election in 1797, addressed the electors of the county of Kildare, declaring his intention of not offering himself as a candidate, and assigning his reasons for that step.

[From "Falkener's Journal," July 27, 1797.]

LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD'S ADDRESS TO THE ELECTORS OF THE COUNTY KILDARE.

I take this opportunity of thanking my fellow-citizens for the favour they conferred on me at the last general election. I hope the conduct I pursued since met their approbation; it was dictated by the purest motives and most fervent wish for the welfare and happiness of Ireland. I shall not offer myself at present a candidate, feeling that, under the present circumstances, there can be no free election in Ireland; any return made will be only by sufferance of the nearest military commanding officer. What is to be expected from a parliament returned under martial law? Looking to the true spirit of the British constitution, I doubt if a body elected under such circumstances, can be called a parliament, or its acts reckoned binding.

I hope my fellow-citizens of the county of Kildare

will not look on my declining to stand a candidate now as abandoning their interests. I trust to see the day when I shall offer myself to represent them in a parliament that will be freely and fairly elected, and can be venerated by all honest men.

Though not your representative, believe me always your faithful servant,

EDWARD FITZGERALD.

Kildare, July 14th, 1797.

The parliament which met the 16th of October, 1796, and ended the 27th of July, 1797, was the last in which Lord Edward sat. He had been a member of the House of Commons fourteen years, when, despairing of effecting any beneficial objects for his country in it, he determined to retire from parliamentary life. Grattan, O'Connor, and Lord Edward, in 1797, appear to have been actuated by the same motives, which led Fox in the previous year, the leader of the opposition in England, to secede from parliament, wearied, and dispirited, and worn out with fruitless efforts to stem the torrent of rampant despotism and antagonism to reform of every kind.

Grattan, Duquerry, Ponsonby, and Sir Laurence Parsons eschewed all overt acts of sedition and high treason. They considered it was unparliamentary for members to "unthread the rude eye of rebellion." It was only permissible for them to rouse the slumbering people, and

stimulate their leaders by their eloquent invectives against government; to speak of swords and daggers, and of the headsman's axe for bad rulers, but in a parliamentary, metaphorical sense only; to make the people believe they were really in earnest with regard to the use of the formidable weapons of which they spoke, and were ready to do and die in defence of their country, when the fitting occasion came.

The government people denounced the opposition in 1797 as covert traitors; and the opposition, dealing with the government party's outrages upon them, retaliated in equally violent language on the Tories. If either faction could have possibly so decried and discredited the other party as to make it safe and facile to hang their opponents, they would apparently have done so with the greatest alacrity.

But there was more of downright earnestness in the violent vindictive language of the Clares, Beresfords, and Castlereaghs, than in the flowers of patriotic eloquence and flights of indignant oratory in support of the cause of reform, and in the denunciations of the boroughmongers. However, the language of the Whig leaders was sufficiently explicit.

Fox had evidently very nearly arrived at the conclusion which O'Connor and Fitzgerald had come to in 1796, that the government was intolerably bad, and that all efforts in parliament to

remedy the evils of its potent despotism were hopeless. And we are told by Moore that "had there existed at that time in England anything like the same prevalent sympathy with the new doctrines of democracy, as responded throughout Ireland, there is no saying how far short of the daring aims of Lord Edward even this great constitutional Whig leader might, in the warmth of his generous zeal, have ventured."

When Lord Edward and O'Connor proceeded on their perilous and momentous mission to the continent, in May, 1796, they passed through London, and Lord Edward is known to have enjoyed the society of his Whig friends, "Charles Fox, Sheridan, and several other distinguished public men." O'Connor was then intimately acquainted with Fox, and it may be reasonably presumed he did not pass through London without visiting Fox, though we have no account of his having done so. We know that he was on terms of social intercourse with Fox on the occasion of his second intended similar mission to the continent, in the early part of 1798, when he passed through London, for that fact was given in evidence on O'Connor's trial at Maidstone by Fox himself; and if O'Connor kept the object of his mission concealed from his friend, Fox must have been greatly deceived in the opinion he had formed of his character, for he swore on that trial that he considered Mr. O'Connor one of the most

candid men he had ever known. Lord Edward's candour, surely, was not less remarkable than O'Connor's. His intimacy with Fox was closer, and his relations with him of a kind more near and dear than those which subsisted between O'Connor and Fox. We may reasonably conclude, then, that Lord Edward's candour was not less manifest in 1796, in his relations with one of his nearest and dearest friends, than it was obvious in his relations with all men in whom he placed implicit trust.

Fox and Grattan were of one opinion as to the intolerable nature of the despotism of Pitt, and of all constitutional government having been made a mere sophism, by the able, unscrupulous, and most unprincipled minister. Fox might have gone to any length for his cause and his country, if he saw his way clearly, and a reasonable prospect of success was in the vista. Grattan was preëminently an orator, the first and best of modern times,—a man of words and not of action. The forum, and not the field, was the proper and appropriate theatre for the grand efforts of his genius in behalf of his country; he might die for it on the floor of the house, more than metaphorically; but as nature husbands her great gifts, and to one man, favoured by her with strength of mind and will, sternness of purpose, unchangeability of resolution, signal intrepidity and prowess, fit for any great attempt, are

given; and to another of her favoured few she grants the glorious privilege of persuading men; of effecting marvellous triumphs over the hearts of people who are not corrupt, depraved, or venal; of swaying the judgments and the imaginations of multitudes of hearers by the powers of that God-like gift of eloquence. But those to whom she gives the toga, and assigns the forum for their sphere of exertion, she incumbers not with sword or shield. She arms them with the weapon of the tongue, and she sends forth her chosen ones to talk for heroes who seem to be ordained and constituted specially to fight. Lord Edward was certainly not of the first-named category; he belonged to the other. He was a man of the class who do not talk much in public. And if an honest man was put on his oath, told to place his hand on his heart, and declare truly his opinion whether this land of Ireland has been most deeply injured in its morals and its mind, by its proneness to be led, governed, and thought for by the talking chiefs and celebrities of the first-mentioned category, or by its disposition to run rashly into schemes and projects devised by the latter, he would have to answer, it is to be feared, "the people of Ireland have been more debauched by the former."

When Grattan returned to the Irish House of Commons, at the close of the reign of terror, he pronounced a memorable judgment on the

crimes against the people of Ireland of the chief state culprit of that disastrous period, the prime minister, William Pitt, which, if just, and if Christianity be true, it were better for that man if he never had been born. "I think now," said Grattan, deliberately and solemnly, addressing the House of Commons, "as I thought then (1798), that the treason of the minister against the liberties of the people, was infinitely worse than the rebellion of the people against the minister."

CHAPTER III

EXPERIENCES IN PARIS

THE latter end of October, 1792, Lord Edward visited Paris; his first letter to his mother from that city is dated 30th of October, and therein he gives an account of an intimate acquaintance with a man of unenviable notoriety, Thomas Paine.

Perhaps the only passage in any letter ever written by Lord Edward, that has met the public eye, which one might desire had not been penned by him, is the following:—

"I lodge with my friend Paine; we breakfast, dine, and sup together. The more I see of his interior, the more I like and respect him. I cannot express how kind he is to me; there is a simplicity of manner, a goodness of heart, and a strength of mind in him, that I never knew a man before possess."

This acquaintance of Lord Edward with Paine was a most disastrous one, there is reason to believe; for in the course of less than three weeks from the date of the above intimation, the London papers copied from the French journals, dated the 10th of November, an announcement which led to Lord Edward's being cashiered.

Paris, November 19th.

Yesterday the English arrived in Paris, assembled at White's hotel, to celebrate the triumph of victories gained over their late invaders by the armies of France. Though the festival was intended to be purely British, the meeting was attended by citizens of various countries, by deputies of the convention, by generals, and other officers of the armies then stationed or visiting Paris—J. H. Stone in the chair.

Among the toasts were "The armies of France: may the example of its citizen soldiers be followed by all enslaved countries, till tyrants and tyranny be extinct."

An address proposed to the National Convention. Among several toasts proposed by the citizens Sir R. Smith and Lord E. Fitzgerald, was the following: "May the patriotic airs of the German Legion (Ca Ira, the Carmagnole, the Marseillaise March, etc.) soon become the favourite music of every army, and may the soldier and citizen join in the chorus."

General Dillon proposed "The people of Ireland; and may government profit by the example of France, and reform prevent revolution."

Sir Robert Smith and Lord E. Fitzgerald renounced their titles; and a toast proposed by the former was drank: "The speedy abolition of hereditary titles and feudal distinctions."

The dismissal of Lord Edward from the army preceded his marriage on the 21st of December, 1792. Mr. Fox called attention in the House of Commons "to certain dismissals which had taken place in the army—those of Lord Semple, Lord

Edward Fitzgerald, and also Captain Growler." Of his near relative, Lord Edward, Fox observed—"He would say from his personal knowledge, that the service did not possess a more zealous, meritorious, or promising member. He had served his country in actual service, and had bled for it."

The first intimation of an acquaintance being made with Madame De Genlis on the part of Lord Edward, is in a letter from Paris, without name of month (but which must have been written in the latter end of October or early in November, 1792), wherein he states that he is to dine that day with Madame Sillery.

The Countess de Genlis, in her work, "Precis de conduite de Madame de Genlis depuis la Revolution," refers to the marriage of Pamela with Lord Edward in the following terms:—

"We arrived at Tournay in the beginning of December of the year 1792. Three weeks after I had the happiness to marry my adopted daughter (*fille d'adoption*), the angelic Pamela, to Lord Edward Fitzgerald."

This event she designates as a recompense of "the best action of her life," namely, the adoption of an "incomparable child," which "Providence had cast into her arms," and the development of that child's reason and intelligence, and those virtues of hers which then rendered her "the model of the wives and mothers of her age."

Mademoiselle d'Orleans (Madame Adelaide), in 1794, in a letter to the Princesse de Conti, thus speaks of the marriage of Pamela:

"A month after our arrival at Tournay, Madame de Genlis married to Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Pamela, a young person whom she (Madame de Genlis) had brought up, and who had set out immediately after her marriage for England."[1]—*Mem. Madame de Genlis,* vol. iv., p. 187.

Ample details and original communications of no ordinary interest, the result of recent researches in France respecting the marriage of Lord Edward Fitzgerald with Pamela, will be found in the notice of the latter, which follows this memoir.

In that notice all the information will be found that is ever likely to be given, or possible to be obtained, respecting the relationship in which Pamela stood to Madame de Genlis, her early history, the mysteriousness in which it is involved, the great trials and vicissitudes of her career, and its mournful termination,—the story of a life that has all the interest of romance, and something even stranger than fiction in its truth.

[1] Amongst the fashionable arrivals from the continent, announced in a London paper in the month of January, 1793, I find the following:—

"3rd January, 1793, Lord Edward Fitzgerald arrived with his bride at Dover from France, immediately after his lordship's marriage."

CHAPTER IV

INTIMACY WITH O'CONNOR

O'CONNOR'S close intimacy with Lord Edward Fitzgerald led to the introduction of the latter into the Society of the United Irishmen. We find Lord Edward accompanying O'Connor to the North, and residing for some weeks in the vicinity of Belfast, on the occasion of the latter offering himself to the electors of Antrim as a candidate for that county. In 1796, O'Connor was daily in social intercourse with Lord Edward at Frescati. A friend of mine, to whom I have had to refer elsewhere as one of the most prized and trusted of Lord Edward's friends, Mr. W. M., informed me he used frequently to meet O'Connor at Frescati at that period, and on one occasion he witnessed a scene there which throws some light on a recent publication of General O'Connor's peculiar sentiments on religious subjects. Mr. M. met at dinner at Frescati a party of five or six persons, amongst whom were Arthur O'Connor and the Rev. Mr. Connolly, parish priest of Booterstown, a preacher of great celebrity at that time. At dinner, and while Lady Fitzgerald was present, Arthur O'Connor was elo-

quent and vehement in his tirades against hypocrisy and superstition, and anon against certain Christian doctrines, and presently against Christianity itself altogether. These escapades of O'Connor were not at all in unison with Lord Edward's sentiments; but in his quality of host he thought himself obliged to bear with what was distasteful to him. Father Connolly's annoyance during dinner was very great, but it was only at the retirement of the lady of the party that he gave vent to his indignation, when O'Connor indulged in some new sallies of raillery and ridicule while descanting on the imbecility of persons who believed that the Bible was the word of God.

Father Connolly, addressing Lord Edward Fitzgerald, said:

My lord, I have sat in silence as long as I could remain silent, listening to the abuse of this gentleman on the clergy of every church, and witnessing the war he has waged on all the fundamental truths of Christianity. My lord, you have a faith to maintain, the character of a Christian man to support for integrity and honour; you have a country to serve, a young and beautiful wife to protect, and innocent children to guard and to watch over. But, my lord, what security is there for your principles as a man of honour, except in religion? what guarantee have you for the integrity of those men in public life in whom you trust, except in religion? what protection have you in your

family against profligacy and licentiousness, except in religion? My lord, the country would not be safe in your charge, if Mr. O'Connor's opinions prevailed over you. Your wife, my lord, would not be safe in the society of a man who outraged all religious tenets, expected nothing from God's goodness in another life, and had nothing to fear from His judgments, here or elsewhere. Neither, my lord, would your children's innocence remain uncorrupted for any length of time in the hearing of the opinions of this gentleman.

This brief, emphatic sermon, *ex cathedra,* pronounced with great solemnity, produced a marvellous effect. If a small bombshell had been thrown amongst the party, the effect could not have been much greater. O'Connor was a man not easily abashed, nor rebuked with impunity, but he bore the chastisement he drew on himself on this occasion with meekness; and it was the opinion of W. M. that it was fortunate for him he did so, for Connolly was a man of great intellectual power, and when roused was a most formidable antagonist. More, in my opinion, was meant by Connolly than met the ear on the occasion above referred to; and in all probability an opportunity long deliberately sought, was at length seized on, for directing Lord Edward's attention to something more important to him than the mere speculative opinions of O'Connor.

In 1797, an occurrence took place on the Curragh of Kildare, which placed a party of mili-

tary gentlemen, some ten or twelve dragoon officers, in a ridiculous position, and displayed the character of Lord Edward, and that peculiar quality of high courage, cool self possession, calm collectedness, self command, and consciousness of power to resist aggression, which distinguished him in all emergencies of danger or difficulties of any kind.

Lord Edward and his friend Arthur O'Connor were riding home at the conclusion of the Curragh races, and had not proceeded very far from the stand when the party above mentioned of dragoon officers galloped after them, whirled round, and intercepted them. One of the party, desperately ambitious of signalizing his valour and his loyalty, commanded Lord Edward to take off his neckerchief, which being of a green colour, was evidently a seditious necktie. The poor would-be-hero little knew the stuff of which the man was made whom he had unfortunately singled out for his experimental exploit. Lord Edward looked at the gentleman fully in the face, calmly and coolly, and he said to him in a deliberate manner, and in that peculiarly quiet tone in which he was wont to speak whenever his mind was made up that a thing of moment was to be done: "Your cloth would speak you to be gentlemen, but this conduct conveys a very different impression. As to this neckcloth that so offends you, all I can say is, here I stand; let

any man among you, who dares, come forward and take it off."

"To make a hazard of new fortunes here" was clearly too desperate a venture for Lord Edward's military assailants. "Big Mars seems bankrupt in the braggart host." The bold dragoons, sadly disconcerted, puzzled, look at each other, doubtful how to proceed, or, to express it more poetically,

> The horsemen sit like fixed candlesticks,
> With torch staves in their hands: and their poor jades
> Lob down their heads, drooping their hides and hips.

In this unpleasant state of things, Mr. O'Connor kindly interposed, and with that remarkable amenity of manner, which he could assume better than most men when he had "something dangerous" in his thoughts, that to a wary adversary was a kind of notice, "which let thy wisdom fear," in the most bland and gentlemanly way observed, if the officers chose to appoint two of their number, his friend Lord Edward and himself would be found in Kildare in readiness to receive any communication from them. This polite intimation had the cooling-down effect that might be expected. The ten or twelve Drawcansir dragoons began to reflect on their folly. The parties separated. The expected challenge was awaited two days, but it did not come.

Thus on many similar occasions was a noble profession disgraced and its service hurt by the relaxation of all discipline in that reign of terror, which the gallant Abercrombie denounced and refused to sanction with his sword.

CHAPTER V

TRIP TO THE CONTINENT

THE military organization of the United Irishmen, which originated in Ulster, was adopted in Leinster towards the end of 1796. By the new organization, the civil officers received military titles; the secretary of each society of twelve, was called the petty officer; each delegate of five societies a captain, having sixty men under his command; and the delegate of ten lower baronial societies was usually the colonel, each battalion being composed of six hundred men. The colonels of each county sent in the names of three persons to the directory, one of whom was appointed by it adjutant-general of the county, who communicated directly with the executive.[1]

We would be led into great error by Arthur O'Connor, if we imagined that an alliance with France had not been, long previously to 1796, sought by the northern leaders of the Society of United Irishmen, and steps taken to effect that

[1] See examination of Arthur O'Connor before the Secret Committee of the House of Lords:—

Com.—When did the military organization begin?

O'Connor.—Shortly after the executive had resolved on resistance to the Irish government, and on an alliance with France, in May, 1796.

object no less strongly desired by Thomas Addis Emmet, John Keogh, and Richard M'Cormick.

The three last-named persons were men of no common order; they were eminently sober-minded, deep-thinking, able, and upright men. Richard M'Cormick, the least known of them, was a man of sound judgment and plain sterling common sense, in whose discretion and integrity the leaders had entire confidence. The readers of Tone's journals will remember the strong terms of regard and esteem in which he is there spoken of under the *sobriquet* of Magog. An extract or two from the journals will suffice to show the nature of his views, and Tone's estimate of him, as early as 1792:—

4th October, 1792.—Dined with Magog, a good fellow; much better than Gog (John Keogh), a Papist; "*wine does wonders.*" Propose to revive Volunteers in the city; Magog thinks we may have 1,000 Catholics before 17th of March next; agreed that he shall begin to canvass for recruits immediately, and continue through the winter. If he succeed, he will resign his office of secretary to the Catholic Committee, and commence a mere Volunteer. Bravo! all this looks well; satisfied that volunteering will be once more the salvation of Ireland. A good thing to have 1,500 men in Dublin. Green uniforms, etc.[1]

In May, 1795, before Tone took his departure

[1] "Tone's Life," vol. i., p. 195.

for America with the resolution of opening communications with the French government through the channel of the French minister at Philadelphia, on the part of the principal leaders of the Society of United Irishmen, to demand the aid of men and arms for Ireland, he had interviews with Keogh, Emmet, Russell, and M'Cormick.

It is unnecessary, I believe, to say that this, my plan, met with the warmest approbation and support both from Russell and Emmet. . . . All my friends made it, I believe, a point to call on me. . . . My friends M'Cormick and Keogh, who had both interested themselves exceedingly all along in my behalf, were, of course, among the foremost. It was hardly necessary to men of their foresight, and who knew me perfectly, to mention my plans; however, for greater certainty, I consulted them both, and I received, as I expected, their most cordial approbation, and they both laid the most positive injunctions upon me to leave nothing unattempted to force my way to France, and lay our situation before the government there, observing, at the same time, that if I succeeded, there was nothing in the power of my country to bestow, to which I might not fairly pretend.

In May, 1796, Lord Edward proceeded on his first treasonable mission to the continent, to be joined there or in London by Arthur O'Connor. Lord Edward, with the view of keeping

up appearances of private objects for his continental journey, was accompanied by Lady Edward Fitzgerald. From London he went to Hamburg, and soon was in treaty with Reinhart, the French minister at that place, having been joined there by Arthur O'Connor. The negotiations were broken off, no one appeared to know why or wherefore. Reinhart was suspected of being a traitor to his government, and not without good reason, as that gentleman's letters to his government, addressed to Charles de la Croix, of which copies were duly furnished to the English government through their consular agent at Hamburg, would seem to prove.[1] O'Connor and Fitzgerald discontinued their negotiations with that minister, quitted Hamburg, and proceeded to Basle. In opening these negotiations with the French Directory through the medium of M. Barthelemi, and in tumbling into the hands of this slippery ecclesiastic, of whose integrity they had no suspicion, they at once

[1] See "Memoirs of Lord Castlereagh," vol. i., p. 272. In justice to M. Reinhart I feel bound to state that I have received a communication from the celebrated French historian, Mons. Mignet, who formerly occupied the post of *Chef des Archives au Ministère des Affaires Etrangères,* a situation which afforded him ample official means of knowing the character and the acts of the men above referred to, and especially of Reinhart and De Lacroix, both in the highest offices of the *Ministère des Affaires des Etrangères*—Reinhart as Diplomatic Minister at Hamburg, and de la Croix as Foreign Minister of State; and that M. Mignet's belief of the incorruptibility of both these persons is expressed in the strongest terms.

placed the secret of their mission in the sympathizing bosom of Mr. William Pitt, and revealed their negotiations with the French Directory. An arrangement was entered into at Basle for effecting a communication with General Hoche (duly sanctioned by the Directory), who was then preparing for the command of the expedition to Ireland, which Tone's exertions had been the means of setting on foot. It was represented to Lord Edward at Basle, that Hoche would only communicate with one negotiator, and that O'Connor alone would be permitted to see the general; eventually, however, that objection was overruled. Accordingly, O'Connor and Lord Edward entered the French territory, and after a conference with Hoche, Lord Edward returned to Hamburg. Lord Edward, on his journey from Basle to Hamburg, had for a *companion de voyage* a spy of the British government, a foreign lady, a former mistress of a colleague of Mr. Pitt, but still in the habit of corresponding with her old *entreteneur,* an intimate friend of the prime minister. Those who desire to know more of the numerous secret correspondents of Mr. Pitt in Paris, all the French ports of importance, in Hamburg and Brussels, not foreign courtezans, but, I lament to say, gentlemen of high standing, several of them United Irishmen, some unquestionably who had figured in the north as leaders, will only have to turn to

the "Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh," published in 1848.

In the spring of 1797, Mr. Edward J. Lewines was sent to France by the Leinster directory, and he proceeded to Paris, and took up his abode there as the resident representative of the Irish nation, duly accredited to the French Republic. In the month of May, 1797, Lord Edward Fitzgerald was sent by the directory of London to meet an emissary of the French government, who had been sent over to procure information as to the exact state of preparation throughout the country for a general rising; and only a month later, the Leinster directory were so importuned with urgent demands for the sanction of the executive for taking the field, that Dr. M'Neven was despatched on a special mission, for the purpose of urging on the French government the necessity of immediate coöperation.

A military committee was appointed in February, 1798; its duty was to prepare a plan of coöperation with the French when they should land, or of insurrection, in case they should be forced to it before the arrival of the French, a step which the directory was determined if possible to avoid. In the memoir delivered to the Irish government by Messrs. Emmet, O'Connor, and M'Neven, it is stated that none of them "were members of the united system until Sep-

tember or October of the year 1796." Emmet became a member of the directory in the month of January, 1797, and in the month of May he seceded from it, and kept aloof from its affairs for about six months. He was again appointed to the executive in the month of December, and continued to belong to it till the 12th of March, 1798, when the arrests took place. Dr. M'Neven became a member of the new organization in September or October, 1796; having previously been secretary to the executive directory, he became a member of it about November, 1797, and continued to be one until March, 1798. Arthur O'Connor became a member of the directory in November, 1796, and continued to belong to it till January, 1798, when he left Ireland.[1] Lord Edward was brought into the Union by Arthur O'Connor in 1796. Moore, on this subject says:—

[1] Arthur O'Connor, in his replies to queries which I addressed to him, says:—"He became a member of the Society of United Irishmen in 1796, and he and Lord Edward Fitzgerald constituted the first Leinster directory. He never took any oath. He had great confidence in the whole northern directory, though less in the steadiness of one living than in that of some others. Of the southern directory, he had implicit confidence in Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Bond, and Jackson. He never was in a directory with Emmet. . . . When O'Connor first applied to Emmet to be of the directory with Jackson and Bond, he declined it. It was not until O'Connor was confined in the Tower of Dublin that Emmet became one of the directory. The first southern directory consisted only of Lord Edward Fitzgerald and O'Connor. The second, of Jackson, Bond, M'Neven, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and O'Connor."

It would appear to have been about the beginning of 1796 that Lord Edward first entered into the Society of the United Irishmen. That he went through the usual form of initiation by an oath is not, I think, probable; for, as in the case of Mr. Arthur O'Connor they dispensed with this condition, it is to be concluded that the high honour and trustworthiness of their initiate would be accorded also towards Lord Edward.

Oliver Bond, a member of the northern executive in 1797, was elected a member of the Leinster directory-general, but declined to act officially, continuing, however, to be in its confidence, and to be consulted with on all affairs of moment. Richard M'Cormick, a stuff manufacturer of Mark's Alley, formerly secretary of the Catholic Committee, was the other member of the directory, though not ostensibly or by specific appointment belonging to it.

In reply to my inquiries concerning the negotiations between the leaders of the Society of United Irishmen and the French government, O'Connor said:—

Before General O'Connor negotiated, in 1796, the treaty for the United Irish with the agent of the French Directory, of which General Hoche's expedition was the result, there never had been any other treaty before that with France. In 1796, he and Lord Edward had an interview with Hoche on the French frontiers, and subsequently negotiations were entered

into with Buonaparte. Buonaparte had a true intention to invade England, and had an army of 20,000 men in readiness for it, when the intelligence of the new designs of Austria and Russia caused that intention to be given up.

The above statement of O'Connor is calculated to make an impression utterly at variance with facts respecting the earnestness of the meditated design of the French government of invading England in 1798—an impression, however, which O'Connor had no idea of making. He speaks, be it observed, of an army of 20,000 men in readiness for the invasion, under the command of Buonaparte. But Buonaparte was only one of eleven generals who were to have commanded *corps d'armée* in that expedition—the first on the list and chief in command. The enormous armament ordered for that expedition far exceeded 200,000 men.

One of the most remarkable documents ever published in relation to the projected invasion, is to be found in the "Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh," that work of vast historical value and importance for its official revelations (which hereafter will be more duly appreciated than it now is), in a paper headed, "Secret Information respecting Hostile Preparations in French Ports in February and March, 1798," vol. i., p. 165.

This secret information, communicated to the British minister by a spy, specially employed, it would appear, to visit all the French ports where preparations were carrying on for the intended invasion, and the French capital of course, where those preparations were organized, it will be seen, was on intimate terms with the United Irishman, Captain Blackwell, and, it may be inferred, in the confidence of the United Irishmen who were to take part in that expedition. The noble editor of the "Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh" truly observes of this remarkable account: "This paper shows with what earnestness and determination Napoleon had undertaken the invasion of England in 1798."

A few extracts from this document will show the important nature of its information:—

SECRET INFORMATION RESPECTING HOSTILE PREPARATIONS IN FRENCH PORTS IN FEBRUARY AND MARCH, 1798.

5th February. Sailed from Gravesend, on board the "Rebecca" sloop, of and for Emden and Flushing, John Thompson, master.

8th. Arrived at Flushing; nothing particular: one 74-gun ship building, one-third finished; one 40-gun ship, and one 16-gun brig. In Flushing road, guardships, some military stores getting ready to ship for France.

11th. Arrived at Bruges. 700 troops to guard the town; no preparations of any kind there.

12th. Ostend. Nothing whatever doing there, and but few troops; expect 4,000 every day.

13th. On the road from Ostend to Dunkirque, passed through Newport; nothing doing there whatever; met General Buonaparte between Furnes and Dunkirque, going to Ostend to inspect the port and make contracts for building flat-bottom boats for the descent.

14th and 15th. At Dunkirque. In the Park, forty flat-bottomed boats complete; three gunboats, three guns each, eighteen or twenty-four pounders; two of the same force in the harbour; one in the road; two frigates in the basin, one complete, the other not; several other vessels, but not fitting out. General Buonaparte contracted for the building of twenty-five gunboats, from fifty to seventy feet long, twenty to twenty-five feet broad, to carry two and three guns each; one hundred pinnaces, to carry fifty men each; all under bond to be complete in forty days from the 15th of February, and made himself responsible for the payment of the whole. The large boats building on the quays of Dunkirque, the pinnaces in the different boat-builders' yards, and in the Park.

16th. Set out for Paris. At Bergh, a small town on the side of the canal from Dunkirque to St. Omer, twenty-one large, flat-bottomed boats building, to be sent to Dunkirque; are made to row a number of oars, and a mast to strike or lay down when needful.

17th. At Lisle. 4,000 troops arrived from Holland,

under marching orders for the coast, with ammunition and arms—all young and able men.

18th. Left Lisle, passed through Douay, Cambray, and Peronne, for Paris; all full of troops, horse and foot.

19th. Arrived at Paris. Full of troops, horse and foot; a guard at every corner of the street, but all quiet. Of the army list troops ordered for the expedition, 275,000 mounted and dismounted, cavalry battalion men, and infantry, all to be within twenty-four hours' forced march of the coast.

OFFICERS NAMED FOR THE EXPEDITION.

General Buonaparte .	Chief in command.
Desaix	General of cavalry.
Baraguay D'Hilliers .	All generals of division, except Kellerman, jun., who is adjutant-general-in-chief of the brigade.
Chateauneuf Randon .	
Kleber	
Sousac Latour . .	
Stengel, junior . .	
Kellerman, junior . .	
Kilmaine	
Dumas	General of brigade.
Le Grand	General of brigade.

22nd. Set out for Evreux to see Captain Thomas Blackwell, captain of chasseurs. In this town 5,000 troops, all ready for marching; went with him to Rouen, where head-quarters are ordered, and now 25,000 troops are ready to march at an hour's notice, mounted and dismounted cavalry, 3,000, the rest are foot, but indifferent men, and badly clothed.

23rd. At Rouen, building on the quay, eleven large

gun-boats, to carry three guns, twenty-four pounders, each, and 250 men, or troops.

24th and 25th. Went down the river with a Danish brig to Havre-de-Grace; on both sides of the river, thirty-nine flat-bottomed boats building, of different dimensions, half-finished, and draw about five or six feet water when complete.

26th. At Havre. In the dock are seven frigates of different dimensions; three are fitted out, but not manned. Flat-bottom gunboats without number, of different dimensions, not complete—boats; eleven carry two or three guns each, eighteen and twenty-four-pounders. In Havre, and the small towns near it, are 21,000 troops ready to embark at short notice. At Honfleur are sixty flat-bottomed boats and gunboats, but could not know to a certainty what number of the latter. All flat-bottomed boats, as soon as complete, are sent from there to Honfleur.

2nd March. Returned to Paris. Met a great many sailors going to Havre, and a number of troops, horse and foot.

4th. 4,000 troops ordered by government to march from Cambray, Douay, and Lisle, for Dunkirque and Calais; same time contract made for two hundred Dutch schoots, for sixty to one hundred tons burden, for carrying stores from different parts of Holland along the coast of France; those schoots are flat-bottomed vessels, drawing from five to seven feet water, loaded.

8th. Left Paris for Calais: on the road, troops and wagons with arms, without number, moving in all directions.

9th. Arrived at Douay. Ninety-one pieces of ar-

tillery in the church-yard, getting ready to set out next day for the coast, with a great number of troops; in the road between Douay and Lisle, seventy wagons, with arms and ammunition for Boulogne, Calais, and Dunkirque. Arrived at Lisle at night; the grand place full of artillery and troops, to march next day for Dunkirque and Calais.

10th. At Calais, fifteen flat-bottom boats building on the same plan as at Dunkirque. Timber and planks on the road everywhere cutting and transporting.

11th. At Gravelines nothing doing, particularly at Dunkirque. On the 12th arrived a great number of troops, with one hundred copper-bottom pontoons, for making floating bridges, about twenty-five feet long, with hooks and chains to link them together. Great preparations making; the gunboats half-finished. Great many of the pinnaces finished, but nothing further particular, etc.

Though a national committee was a part of the plan of the original organization, the election of national delegates did not take place till the beginning of December, 1797, and then only partially. The National Committee, the 26th of February, 1798, passed several resolutions, two of which are worthy of attention.[1]

[1] "Resolved, That we pay no attention whatever to any attempts that may be made by either House of Parliament to divert the public mind from the grand object which we have in view, as nothing short of the complete emancipation of our country will satisfy us.

"Resolved, That the counties of Carlow, Meath, Wicklow, Derry, Down, and Antrim deserve well of their country, for their

With respect to the total number of armed men in the Union throughout the country, as estimated by Lord Edward Fitzgerald, when a rising was eventually determined on in the month of March, 1798, the particulars are specified in a document presented by Lord Edward to Mr. Thomas Reynolds, the informer. The document referred to emanated from the National Committee, and is thus described in the report of the Secret Committee of the Irish Parliament, 1798:—

PAPER COPIED BY MR. T. REYNOLDS FROM ONE IN THE HANDWRITING OF LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD, AND GIVEN BY LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD TO MR. REYNOLDS.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1798.

	Armed men.	Finances in hand.
Ulster, ...	110,990	£436 2 4
Munster, . . .	100,634	147 17 2
Kildare, . . .	10,863	110 17 7
Wicklow, . . .	12,895	93 6 4
Dublin, ...	3,010	37 2 6
Dublin City, . .	2,177	321 17 11
Queen's County, .	11,689	91 2 1

manly offer of emancipating her directly; but that they be requested to bear the shackles of tyranny a little longer, until the whole kingdom shall be in such a state of organization as will, by their joint coöperation, effect without loss their desirable point, which is hourly being accomplished, and will tend most expeditiously to bring about a union of the four provinces, three only having as yet come forward."

	Armed men.	Finances in hand.
King's County . .	3,600	£21 11 3
Carlow, ...	9,414	49 2 10
Kilkenny, . . .	624	10 2 3
Meath, ...	1,400	171 2 1
Total, . . .	279,896	£1,485 4 9

By this document it would appear that the total number of armed men throughout the country was estimated by Lord Edward at 279,896. It will be found, however, there is an error of 12,600 in the tot of returns of the armed men of the several counties; it should be 267,296, instead of 279,896. There is an error also in the tot of the finances in hand; it should be £1,490 4s. 4d., instead of £1,485 4s. 9d.

But from another source, and one whose authenticity is unquestionable, the writer has reason to know that Lord Edward imagined that when once he had raised the standard of revolt, 100,000 effective men might be immediately expected to rally round it.

I have elsewhere referred to a very remarkable meeting which took place at the Shakspeare Gallery, Exchequer Street, about a month before the arrests in March, when Lord Edward specially requested his confidential friend, W. M., my informant, to attend a conference with the delegates from the different counties re-

specting the projected rising. The account of the discussion which ensued on that occasion was taken down by me in writing, I may say from the lips of W. M., the same night on which it was related to me. That gentleman no longer exists, but he saw that account as it was published by me in the first edition of this work; and he stated that it was in every respect an exact report of his relation of the facts referred to. W. M. was a man of strict veracity, no less remarkable for the singular perspicuity and comprehensiveness of his views, than for the solidity and soundness of his judgment. He was a self-educated, vigorous-minded man, of "strong, sound, round-about common sense;" of great powers of understanding, the natural strength of which I have never seen surpassed. Those great qualities of his were well known and appreciated, subsequently to the period of which I treat, by the chief governors of Ireland, under every liberal administration, for a period of some twenty years before his death, which event occurred in 1850.

To that portion of his statement which has reference to Lord Edward's views and his own on the subject of the contemplated general rising in April, 1798, I shall only recur in this memoir of Lord Edward Fitzgerald.

Lord Edward having expressed his opinion that in the existing circumstances of the country

the time for action had come, that no foreign aid was then to be expected, and that even without it the chances of success were greatly in favour of the attempt, and having produced returns of the force to be relied on, he said: "Here are returns that show that 100,000 armed men may be counted on to take the field." "My lord," replied his friend, "it is one thing to have 100,000 men on paper, and another in the field. A hundred thousand men on paper will not furnish 50,000 in array. I, for one, am enrolled amongst the number; but I candidly tell you, you will not find me in the ranks. You know for what objects we joined this Union, and what means we reckoned on for carrying them into effect. Fifteen thousand Frenchmen were considered essential to our undertaking. If they were so at that time, still more so are they now, when our warlike aspect has caused the government to pour troops into the country." "What!" said Lord Edward, "would you attempt nothing without these 15,000 men—would you not be satisfied with 10,000?" "I would, my lord," replied his friend, "if the aid of the fifteen could not be procured."

"But," continued Lord Edward, "if even the ten could not be got, what would you do then?"

"I would then accept of five, my lord," was the reply.

"But," said Lord Edward, fixing his eyes

with great earnestness on him, "we cannot get 5,000, and with respect to the larger force we originally wished for, had we succeeded with so large a body of French troops, we might have found it difficult enough to get rid of our allies." To this it was replied, "My lord, if we found it possible to get rid of our enemies, who are more than ten times as numerous as our allies, we could have little difficulty in getting rid of the latter when necessity required it."

"But, I tell you we cannot," said Lord Edward, "get even the 5,000 you speak of, and when you know that we cannot, will you desert our cause?"

"My lord," said W. M., "if five thousand men could not be obtained, I would seek the assistance of a sufficient number of French officers to head our people; and with three hundred of these, perhaps we might be justified in making an effort for independence, but not without them. What military men have we of our own to lead our unfortunate people into action against a disciplined army?"

Lord Edward ridiculed the idea of there being anything like discipline at that time in the English army. "Besides, the numbers," he said, "of the United Irishmen would more than counterbalance any superiority in the discipline of their enemies."

"My lord," said his friend, "we must not be

deceived. They are disciplined, and our people are not. If the latter are repulsed and broken, who is to reform their lines? Once thrown into disorder, the greater their numbers, the greater will be the havoc made amongst them."

Lord Edward said, without risking a general engagement, he would be able to get possession of Dublin.

"Suppose you did, my lord," was the reply, "the possession of the capital would not insure success . . You, my lord, are the only military man amongst us; but you cannot be everywhere you are required; and the misfortune is, you delegate your authority to those whom you think are like yourself. But they are not like you; we have no such persons amongst us."

The delegates assented to the justice of these remarks, declaring that the proposal for the aid of the French officers was a reasonable one, when Lord Edward impatiently reminded them that they had no assistance to expect from France, and that consequently the determination had been come to to prepare the country for an immediate rising. The conference terminated in divided opinions.

Lord Edward and his friend, nevertheless, parted with the same cordiality and confidence in each other that had always subsisted between them.

"Lord Edward," says that friend,—no bad

judge of men—one who weighed well the terms in which he gave utterance to his opinions—who knew his lordship, perhaps better than any other of his associates, "was the noblest minded of human beings. He had no deceit, no selfishness, no meanness, no duplicity in his nature. He was all frankness, openness, and generosity; but he was not the man to conduct a revolution to a successful issue—that man was Thomas Addis Emmet." Perhaps if he, Mr. M., had said, the men in council to organize a conspiracy calculated to conduct an insurrection to a successful issue in an accomplished revolution, were Theobald Wolfe Tone, Arthur O'Connor, and Thomas Addis Emmet, provided they could have acted through such a struggle, and to its end, in concert, and with equal singleness of purpose and forgetfulness of self on either part; and the man of action was Lord Edward Fitzgerald, to assume the chief military command—a leader capable of inspiring confidence, exacting obedience, providing against contingent dangers, supplying all deficiencies incidental to the condition of insurgent forces, of being prepared for reverses, and rising up from temporary defeat or unavoidable discomfiture with renewed ardour, more active ingenuity, and a firmer resolution to repair any injury sustained, by having recourse to new strategy, devising on the spur of the occasion new plans and operations, and

substituting for regular military tactics all available agencies and instruments fit for modes of warfare learned by experience in the analogous circumstances of a revolted people in another land,—the opinion above stated, thus extended, might be better founded.

CHAPTER VI

PLANS FOR ESCAPE

A VERY short time subsequently to the arrests at Bond's, it was known in England to one of the Leinster family, who appears to have had access to the Duke of Portland and a confidential knowledge of his views, that Lord Edward's escape would probably be connived at; and even previous to the arrests of the 12th of March, when Mr. Ogilvie had an interview with Lord Clare in reference to the reported connection of Lord Edward with the Society of United Irishmen, of which government was then informed, Lord Clare, with manifest earnestness and warmth of feeling, said:—"For God's sake, get this young man out of the country: the ports shall be thrown open to you, and no hindrance whatever offered." All Mr. Ogilvie's subsequent efforts to move Lord Edward to avail himself of this generous and indulgent disposition of the government—(*O si sic omnes!*)—were in vain. Lord Edward's last reply to his friend's pressing solicitation to abandon his connection with the cause he had embarked in, and to retire from the country for some time, was conclusive as to

the fixedness of his resolution:—"It is now out of the question: I am too deeply pledged to these men to be able to withdraw with honour."

Immediately previous to the arrests at Bond's, Lord Edward and his lady were sojourning at Leinster House in Kildare Street. Search was made for him there in vain. Timely notice had been given to Lady Edward on the arrival of the officers at Leinster House, and of the object of their visit, if she had desired to destroy any papers of Lord Edward's of a dangerous nature; but either her presence of mind forsook her, or she had no knowledge of one document in particular being in the writing-case of Lord Edward, of a seditious character, which alone was sufficient to place his life in extreme jeopardy. This paper is not stated in the report of the Secret Committee, whence I take it to be in the handwriting of Lord Edward; but no doubt is entertained by those most competent to form an opinion on the subject, that it was composed and written by Lord Edward:—

COPY OF A PAPER FOUND IN THE WRITING-BOX OF LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD, ON THE 12TH OF MARCH, BY THE OFFICER WHO WENT ON THAT DAY TO ARREST HIM UNDER A CHARGE OF TREASON.

If ever any unfortunate cause should put our city, with the other parts of the country, into the possession of a cruel and tyrannical enemy, whose government, by

repeated oppressions, might drive us into the last stage of desperate resistance, our conduct then should be regulated in a manner best calculated for obtaining victory. The following thoughts are humbly offered for the inspection of every real Irishman:—

It is supposed that the enemy have a well-appointed and disciplined standing army.

In such a case every man ought to consider how that army could be attacked or repelled, and what advantage their discipline and numbers might give them in a populous city, acting in concert with the adjoining counties.

It is well known that an officer of any skill in his profession would be very cautious of bringing the best disciplined troops into a large city in a state of insurrection, for the following reasons:

His troops, by the breadth of the streets, are obliged to have a very narrow front, and however numerous, only three men deep can be brought into action, which, in the widest of our streets, cannot be more than sixty men, as a space must be left on each side or flank, for the men who discharge to retreat to the rere, that their places may be occupied by the next in succession, who are loaded; so, though there are a thousand men in a street, not more than sixty can act at one time; and should they be attacked by an irregular body armed with pikes or such bold weapons, if the sixty men in front were defeated, the whole body, however numerous, are unable to assist, and immediately become a small mob in uniform, from the inferiority of number in comparison to the people, and easily disposed of.

Another inconvenience might destroy the order of

this army. Perhaps at the same moment they may be dreadfully galled from the house-tops by showers of bricks, coping-stones, etc., which may be at hand, without imitating the women of Paris, who carried the stones of the unpaved streets to the windows and tops of the houses in their aprons.

Another disadvantage on the part of the soldiers would be, as they are regulated by the word of command, or stroke of the drum, they must be left to their individual discretion, as such communications must be drowned in the noise and clamour of a popular tumult.

In the next place, that part of the populace who could not get into the engagement, would be employed in unpaving the streets, so as to impede the movements of horse or artillery; and in the avenues where the army was likely to pass, numbers would be engaged forming barriers of hogsheads, carts, cars, counters, doors, etc., the forcing of which barriers by the army would be disputed, while like ones were forming at every twenty or thirty yards, or any convenient distances situation might require. Should such precautions be well observed, the progress of an army through one street, or over one bridge, would be very tedious, and attended with great loss, if it would not be destroyed. At the same time, the neighbouring counties might rise in a mass, and dispose of the troops scattered in their vicinity, and prevent a junction or a passage of any army intended for the city; they would tear up the roads, and barricade every convenient distance with trees, timber, implements of husbandry, etc., at the same time lining the hedges, walls, ditches, and

houses with men armed with muskets, who would keep up a well-directed fire.

However well exercised standing armies are supposed to be by frequent reviews and sham battles, they are never prepared for broken roads or enclosed fields, in a country like ours, covered with innumerable and continued intersections of ditches and hedges, every one of which is an advantage to an irregular body, and may with advantage be disputed against an army, as so many fortifications and entrenchments.

The people in the city would have an advantage by being armed with pikes or such weapons. The first attack, if possible, should be made by men whose pikes were nine or ten feet long: by that means they could act in ranks deeper than the soldiery, whose arms are much shorter; then the deep files of the pikemen, by being weightier, must easily break the thin order of the army.

The charge of the pikemen should be made in a smart trot. On the flank or extremity of every rank, there should be intrepid men placed to keep the fronts even, that at closing every point should tell together; they should have, at the same time, two or three like bodies at convenient distances in the rere, who would be brought up, if wanting, to support the front, which would give confidence to their brothers in action, as it would tend to discourage the enemy; at the same time, there should be in the rere of each division, some men of spirit to keep the ranks as close as possible.

The apparent strength of the army should not intimidate, as closing on it makes its powder and ball

useless; all its superiority is in fighting at a distance; all its skill ceases, and all its action must be suspended, when once it is within reach of the pike.

The reason of printing and writing this, is to remind the people of discussing military subjects.

From the time of the arrests in Bond's, namely, the 12th of March, 1798, Lord Edward was "on his keeping," as the term is, avoiding arrest by frequent changes of domicile. The earliest place of concealment of his was in a small house at Harold's Cross, near John Keogh's residence at Mount Jerome (now the Protestant cemetery) and on the same side of the way, but a little northward of Mount Jerome. There, I am informed by the venerable Mr. Patten, the brother in-law of T. A. Emmet, he called on Lord Edward some time in the spring of 1798, after the arrests at Bond's. It is a singular coincidence that the vicinity of John Keogh's seat at Mount Jerome should be selected by the two leading men of different insurrections for places of refuge and concealment, in 1798 and 1803.

Lord Edward next appears to have taken up his abode at Dr. Kennedy's in Aungier Street, and while there he was constantly visited by Mr. William Lawless, surgeon, professor of anatomy and physiology in the College of Surgeons. He was visited there also by Mr. Thomas Reynolds,

who, previously to the arrests at Bond's, had been known to Lord Edward and trusted by him; and there appears no reason to doubt that the same ill-placed confidence which at that time was reposed in this arch-traitor, was still placed in him during the whole term of the concealment of Lord Edward, and in his various removals from house to house.

There was a sort of casuistry in all the reasoning of Reynolds in regard to his conduct as an informer, which was had recourse to, no doubt, originally to impose on others, but which merged into a systematic cajolery that eventually deluded himself.

I do not believe that Reynolds gave the information to the government which procured for the informer £1,000 for the discovery of Lord Edward. Reynolds had a kind of regard and respect for Lord Edward; for we find even the greatest villains frequently manifest an involuntary appreciation of very exalted heroism or virtue. They feel as if they were compelled, in spite of themselves, to reverence great and generous qualities like those which Lord Edward possessed.

But though Reynolds, probably, would not denounce him himself, nor think it decent to sell a man's blood, from whom it was known he had received great and substantial acts of kindness, Reynolds could have reconciled it to his very

peculiarly constituted mind and perverted moral sense, to put an acquaintance in whose welfare he felt an interest, in the way of doing a stroke of business in his own line, and to enable his *protégé* to pocket £1,000 for a little bit of information concerning Lord Edward's hiding-place on a particular occasion.[1] Lord Edward was removed, disguised, from Harold's Cross on the Thursday after the arrests at Bond's, to the house of a widow lady of the name of Dillon, an acquaintance of Surgeon Lawless, residing close to the canal at Portobello Bridge, but a little to the westward of the hotel. The principal entrance to the house, which still exists, is by a street at the rere of the Portobello Hotel. Lord Edward, while he remained in this place of concealment, visited Lady Fitzgerald, who was then residing in Denzille Street with her children, attended by a female servant of hers and her husband's valet, the "faithful Tony."

When Irish painters are in want of a subject for a picture, let them take the scene described by the maid servant of Lady Edward:—"On going into her lady's room late in the evening, she saw his lordship (whom all the servants had been told had fled to France several days previously) and Lady Edward sitting together by

[1] The identity of the betrayal of Lord Edward Fitzgerald has been established since the writing of the above. The account of his life and the unveiling of the mystery surrounding his betrayal will be found in the appendix.—Ed.

the light of the fire. The youngest child had been brought down out of its bed for him to see it, and both he and Lady Edward were, as she thought, in tears."

We hear nothing of Tony seeing his master during this night's visit to Denzille Street; but we may take it for granted the faithful servant and the kind and loving master, whose knowledge of one another was now nearly of fifteen years' standing, met on that occasion, and that well-known black face, which his master, in one of his letters from Canada, said was the only one he cared to look on, was once more beheld by him.

Poor Tony was unable to visit his master at any of his subsequent places of concealment. When Mrs. Dillon called one day at Denzille Street to report Lord Edward's safety and well-being, Tony lamented to Mrs. Dillon, "that his unfortunate face prevented him from going to see his dear master."

Lord Edward returned the same night to Mrs. Dillon's. He remained about three weeks in that asylum.

Lord Edward was next removed to the house of Murphy, the feather merchant, in Thomas Street. His conductor on this occasion was the same Mr. Lawless by whom he had been brought to Mrs. Dillon's at Portobello. He was disguised on the last occasion as a countryman in

a long frieze coat, rather incongruously associated, for the purpose of disguise, with a pig-tailed wig. He was kindly received on this his first visit to Murphy's, and remained there on that occasion about a fortnight, during which time he held several consultations on the subject of the intended ensuing insurrection, with Lawless, a Mr. Plunket, styled Major Plunket, and a Colonel Lumm. During Lord Edward's first sojourn at Murphy's, he again visited Denzille Street, disguised as a woman. That visit was unexpected by Lady Edward, and a few days subsequently to it, the excitement and anxiety it occasioned led to her premature confinement. Her youngest and second daughter, Emily, was born in Denzille Street in the latter part of April.

The beginning of May, the long looked-for aid from France being at length despaired of, a general rising was determined on, and the time fixed for it was the 23rd of May, when Lord Edward was to put himself at the head of the forces of the United Irishmen of Leinster. The vigilance of the authorities from that time necessitated frequent changes of Lord Edward's place of concealment. From Murphy's he was taken to the house of Mr. John Cormick, a feather merchant in the same street, No. 22. There he was visited by the well known John Hughes. He passed a week subsequently at

the house of Mr. James Moore, also residing in Thomas Street, No. 119, whose daughter, then unmarried, a person of great intelligence and enthusiasm in Lord Edward's cause, was constantly employed during the time he remained in her father's house, conveying communications to and from Lord Edward's friends.[1]

Lord Edward was likewise in concealment for some days at the house of Mr. Bartholomew Gannon, a linen draper, No. 22 Corn Market, subsequently of Bridge Street, I have been informed by Mr. James Davock, a silk merchant of Bridge Street, a member of the Society of United Irishmen, well known to Lord Edward, and by him attended on the occasion of some of his removals.

About the middle of May Lord Edward proceeded with Neilson on horseback to examine the country in the vicinity of Dublin on the borders of Kildare, and on his return he was arrested by a patrol at Palmerstown, and closely examined by them. His companion Neilson pretended to be drunk and unconscious of the questions put to him. Lord Edward described himself as a doctor, and his account of himself and the business he was on satisfied the party. They lost an

[1] This lady, whom I knew in 1842, then the widow of a Mr. M'Cready, was still residing in the same house Lord Edward had been concealed in. To her vivid recollections of Lord Edward and many of his associates, I am indebted for much of the information contained in this memoir.—R. R. M.

opportunity of making £1,000; Lord Edward and Neilson were set at liberty.

On the 17th of May, five days only before the period fixed for the general rising, in an unlucky hour for Lord Edward, he was conducted for the second time to Murphy's house, where it was intended he should remain till the outbreak. The result of that proceeding will be found in the valuable and authentic narrative of Murphy. The night of his arrival there, attended by several persons, he proceeded from Murphy's house in the direction of Usher's Island.

The persons who occasionally formed his guard, who visited him, or who accompanied him when he went abroad, were the following:—Surgeon Lawless, Major Plunket, Colonel Lumm, Samuel Neilson, John Hughes, James Davock, William Cole, Richard Keane, C. Gallagher, Palmer Rattigan, William P. M'Cabe, and Walter Cox. The night after his *rencontre* with Major Sirr, on the 17th of May, he was attended by W. P. M'Cabe, Patrick Gallagher, Palmer, and Rattigan.

Sirr had received information that Lord Edward's body guard, a party selected from their known courage and trustworthiness, for attendance on him when he went abroad, would be on their way from Thomas Street to Usher's Island at a certain hour that night. Accompanied by several of his men, O'Brien, and Mr. Emerson,

an attorney, Sirr proceeded to the place where he expected to meet Lord Edward, and divided his party, directing some of them to approach Usher's Island by Watling Street, and others by Dirty Lane. Lord Edward's party had adopted the same course, and the result was a conflict in both streets between Sirr's people and Lord Edward's party. In one of these *rencontres* the major was knocked down, and was very nearly losing his life. He defended himself bravely and successfully. The major, however, was only too happy to save himself on this occasion and to allow his assailants to escape. The major has given a brief account of this *rencontre.* One of Lord Edward's band has given another, and from the latter account the following particulars are taken.

When Lord Edward went abroad during the time of his concealment, he was usually preceded by one of his guard thirty or forty yards in advance, and two men on the opposite side of the way at some distance from one another. On the present occasion when he was recognized by Sirr, the persons attending him were not seen, and Lord Edward was on the point of being seized, when Sirr found himself in the grasp of two powerful young men. One of them snapped a pistol at Sirr, and the other, Gallagher, struck at his neck with a dagger, and pierced his stock without inflicting any wound. M'Cabe was not

present when this scuffle took place. He was at the bottom of Bridgefoot Street, close to Usher's Island, at that moment, watching the movements of the other party, by whom he was arrested. Sirr's struggle with Gallagher was one of life and death. Lord Edward, during this struggle, having got clear of Sirr and his myrmidons, Palmer and Gallagher thought it prudent to decamp, leaving the major little inclined to pursue them. On the following day it was determined by Lord Edward and his friends, that he should remove on the next evening from Murphy's to the house of a Mrs. Risk, at Sandymount. The appearance of the soldiers in the morning in Thomas Street, caused him to give up the idea of then removing. His arrest the same evening, however, put an end to all his plans; but his faithful friends even at this trying moment did not desert him. The sedan chair in which he was placed no sooner moved from Murphy's door, than Major Sirr and his party were assailed by a number of persons, and a desperate, but unsuccessful attempt was made to rescue their prisoner.

This effort was directed by Edward Rattigan, assisted by Gallagher. Rattigan was a director of the watchhouse of St. Catherine's; and the moment he received an intimation of Lord Edward's danger, he called on the first people he met to accompany him to the watchhouse; he

seized on all the arms that were deposited there, and proceeded with all despatch to Murphy's. Major Sirr acknowledged they must have succeeded, had not the Ransford Street Guard and the picquet-guard of the Castle, chiefly cavalry, for the assistance of which he had previously sent from Murphy's, opportunely arrived.[1]

When M'Cabe was arrested that night of the rencontre with Sirr's party, he first said his name was Jameson (a name which Lord Edward went by when he was at the house of the Widow Dillon at the canal); subsequently he said his name

[1] In the valuable collection of Major Sirr's manuscript papers and correspondence, existing in nine quarto volumes in the library of Trinity College, presented to that institution by the Rev. Joseph D'Arcy Sirr, there is a memorandum in the handwriting of the major of much interest, which I have copied from the original:—

"The attack on the 18th May in Watling Street was reported to Neilson next day. He was informed I was stabbed, and that I wounded two—one desperately with cuts and stabs, whose life is despaired of. One very nearly connected with him was in the affray. One of the party was certainly taken, who he says is a Scotchman. He dined with Lord Edward Fitzgerald the day his lordship was taken, and had only left him about an hour before. He and Lord Edward were taken about five weeks ago at the hill above Palmerstown by a patrol of the artillery commanded by a young officer. Lord Edward was in the disguise of a labouring man, and both were on common car horses, but good trotters. Neilson pretended to be dead drunk, and after being in custody for some time, they were again liberated. Lord Edward did lodge at Murphy's about five weeks, and Neilson took him from it and removed him frequently. Lord Edward was certainly removed the 18th May, and went through Watling Street the time of the attack. Neilson declares that he collected fourteen men to rescue Lord Edward on the night he was taken, which he would certainly have"—[Here the memorandum of Major Sirr breaks off.]

was Brand. M'Cabe was taken to the Provost and examined by Major Sandys. M'Cabe answered in broad Scotch, that he was a poor Scotch peddler who dealt in muslins, and was going home peaceably to his lodgings when he was arrested. A weapon, however, was found upon him, not very corroborative of his peaceful pursuits. He was asked what peddlers had to do with pistols? He said the pistol found on him belonged to a friend of his who had sent it to be repaired, and had asked him to call for it that evening. He was kept in confinement, and the following day walked out of his prison without the permission of Major Sandys, but with the knowledge and connivance of a serjeant of the Dumbarton fencibles, to whom M'Cabe had managed to introduce himself as a townsman whom he had some recollection of when a boy.

Palmer contrived to make his escape from Dublin, joined M'Cabe in a few days in the County Wicklow, and both were in the neighbourhood of Ballinamuck in the month of August, when the French landed. They then thought it was time to give up their cause and quit the country, which they contrived to do without detection. Palmer settled in Holland, and was drowned by the upsetting of a boat. M'Cabe died in France possessed of considerable means. The history of this man is so singular, that I

propose giving some more detailed account of his extraordinary career.

Rattigan and Gallagher, after their ineffectual attempt to rescue Lord Edward on the 19th of May, perceived that they had been particularly observed by a person who happened to be passing by when they attacked Sirr's party. This person, a Mr. Cusack of the revenue corps, they approached, detained him for some time, and threatened him with death if he did not promise to be silent on the subject of the struggle he had witnessed, and those who were engaged in it.

Cusack the following day gave information to Sirr, but Rattigan in the meantime had absconded; and on the 21st the major proceeded to the house of his mother, a widow lady, who kept a timber-yard in Bridgefoot Street, to avenge the injured majesty of his offended person; for Sirr often said "he would teach people to meddle with him or his men;" and accordingly all unfortunate persons so offending were charged with treason, and their disaffected plate and pictures were confiscated to the sideboard or the walls which represented the state.

A party of the major's men, duly attended by a military force, rushed into the house of the widow Rattigan, searched for pikes, and found the necessary quantity to justify a summary visitation on the premises. The inmates were

thrust forth; all that was valuable in the house was pillaged. The furniture was then thrown into the street, the timber in the yard set on fire, and the house and premises utterly destroyed. This was to teach people how to meddle with the major.[1]

Gallagher, who was shopman to Mrs. Moore of Thomas Street, in whose house Lord Edward had at one time been concealed, was particularly obnoxious to the major.

A plundering expedition, on the plea of searching for concealed arms, had a short time before been undertaken, and Messrs. Sirr, Hanlon, and O'Brien were baffled on this occasion by Gallagher and his friend Palmer, who happened to be present. They managed to keep the party at bay till there had been time to remove whatever was in most danger of disappearing, and Palmer concealed himself in a loft in an outbuilding, where he contemplated taking Sirr's life. He had a loaded pistol in his hand, presented in the direction he momentarily expected to see Sirr approach, when another person accompanying Sirr at that moment to the entrance, threw Palmer off his guard. Major Sirr was told of this circumstance, as related by Palmer

[1] Edward Rattigan, Cox states, subsequently took a part with the Carlow insurgents, and was wounded at the battle of Hacketstown. Eventually he succeeded in quitting the country, made his way to France, became a soldier, and was killed at the battle of Marengo. He was born in 1769.

a few years before his death, by a gentleman now living in Dublin, and he acknowledged he had subsequently heard his life was in some danger on that occasion.

Palmer was a remarkably fine young man, of great energy of mind, and strength and activity of body. He was the son of a hosier in Cutpurse Row.

Gallagher, whose dagger had been so near the major's neck on the 19th of May, was arrested, tried by court-martial, and sentenced to be hanged. A young woman of some accomplishments and personal attractions, the following day went with two small children to a gentleman in whose family she had formerly lived as a governess. This gentleman was a master in chancery, and possessed much influence at the Castle. This poor girl passed herself off as the wife of the prisoner, whose life she besought this gentleman to interfere in behalf of, thinking an application of that kind coming from a wife would have more effect.

This humane gentleman, whose political opinions were directly opposite to those of Gallagher, went off immediately to the Castle, and succeeded in obtaining the prisoner's pardon. Gallagher was now removed from the Provost to a transport that was then lying in the bay, to be sent out of the country.

Some days elapsed before the vessel was pre-

pared for her long voyage. During that time Gallagher was permitted to see his friends on board, and even to have a parting dance on deck the evening before their intended departure. During the bustle of the party Gallagher escaped out of the cabin window. The tide was then ebbing, and after swimming some short distance, he was picked up by a boat that was in readiness to receive him, and was taken to Howth. In this boat he was seen by Major Sirr when pulling towards the vessel with some prisoners who were going on board. He suspected all was not right, but was not sufficiently sure of having any grounds for suspicion, and did not chase the boat. Gallagher got to Dublin, and there, disguised as a groom, succeeded in leaving the country. He went to Bordeaux, entered into business, married respectably, returned some years ago to Ireland, then went back to France, where he died in excellent circumstances and in good repute.

When the government determined on the arrests of the principal leaders of the Society of United Irishmen at Bond's, on the 12th of March, 1798, and of the members of the Directory, besides the orders for the arrests at Bond's, there were separate warrants for the apprehension of the members of the Directory, and all were arrested with the exception of Lord Edward, who was with M'Neven at the moment the officers entered the domicile of the latter; but as

his name was not included in the warrant for M'Neven's arrest, Lord Edward was allowed to depart. The warrant for his arrest was placed in the hands of a messenger, attended by the sheriff and a party of soldiers, commanded by O'Reilly. Leinster House, where Lady Fitzgerald was then staying, was searched in vain for Lord Edward. Frescati was searched also in vain for him; but in both places his papers were seized.

In the "Dublin Gazette," May 10th to 12th, 1798, a proclamation appeared, dated May 11th, 1798, offering a reward of £1,000 for the discovery of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, "so as that he may be apprehended and committed to prison." This proclamation was signed by the Lord Lieutenant and council, by the Archbishop of Cashel, Lord Clare, the Archbishop of Tuam, Lords Westmeath, Shannon, Roden, Portarlington, Ely, Dillon, Pery, O'Neil, Castlereagh, Glentworth, Rossmore, Henry Bishop of Meath, George Lewis Bishop of Kildare, John Beresford, Sir John Blaquiere, Theobald Jones, Arthur Wolfe, Robert Ross, Isaac Corry, George Morris.

The members of the Privy Council (the list of which council for the year 1798 comprises a hundred names) who virtually administered the government of Ireland during the period of the viceroyalty of the Earl Camden, "the Reign of

Terror," whose names are found affixed to all measures of coercion (to each proclamation, varying from ten to twenty, on one occasion proclaiming martial law, the 24th of May, to forty-one), are the following:—Lords Clare, Castlereagh, Carhampton, Clonmel, Drogheda, Bellamont, Dillon, Ely, Carleton, Waterford, Portarlington, Ormond and Ossory, Muskerry, Tyrawly, Pery, O'Neil, Shannon, Altamont, Glentworth, Gosford, Rossmore, Westmeath, Meath, Roden, Farnham, William (Dr. Newcome) Archbishop of Armagh, Charles (Dr. Agar) Archbishop of Cashel, William (Hon. Dr. Beresford) Archbishop of Tuam, George Lewis, Bishop of Kildare, Henry Bishop of Meath, Right Hon. Thomas Pelham, John Beresford, John Monck Mason, Theophilus Jones, John Foster, Lodge Morris, Robert Ross, David Latouche, Isaac Corry, Sir Henry Cavendish, Sir John Blaquiere, Joseph Cooper, Sir Hercules Langrishe, Sir John Parnell, Sackville Hamilton, James Fitzgerald, Arthur Wolfe.

In the above list, it must be observed, names will be found of privy councillors whose position and official connection with the government rendered it necessary for them, in many instances I have reason to believe, to give their signatures to ordinances for the enforcement of measures which they had no power to oppose and had no share in advising the adoption of.

Capture of Lord Edward Fitzgerald

Showing Portraits of Capt. Ryan and Major Sirr, his Captors. From a Drawing by George Cruikshank

CHAPTER VII

CAPTURE OF LORD EDWARD

THE following narrative of the arrest of Lord Edward Fitzgerald at the house of Mr. Nicholas Murphy, No. 153 Thomas Street, was drawn up by the latter, during the period of his long confinement in Newgate, and that portion of it relating to events of a later date, written subsequently to his liberation, at different and evidently at distant intervals. From the time of his death it remained in the hands of his sister, who is still living in the city of Dublin.

Having come to the knowledge of the existence of this document, and having reason to believe the information it contained might tend to throw much light on a transaction which has hitherto been involved in mystery, I applied to the sister of Mr. Murphy for it, through a mutual friend, the late Mr. William Powell, a man of great worth and integrity, and with some difficulty was permitted to take a copy of it.

The narrative of Murphy is a plain, unvarnished tale, told by an honest man in simple language—by one not much indebted to education for any literary attainments, but indebted

to nature at least for one noble quality,—a sense of honour, which no earthly inducement to swerve from could pervert.

I have given Murphy's narrative in his own language, without any other correction than that of the orthography, which the document certainly stood very much in need of.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE ARREST OF THE LATE LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD. WRITTEN BY NICHOLAS MURPHY, IN WHOSE HOUSE THE ARREST TOOK PLACE.

On the night of Friday, the 18th May, 1798, Lord Edward Fitzgerald came to my house (No. 153 Thomas Street), in company with a lady,[1] about the hour of ten or eleven o'clock at night. I did expect him the previous evening; and the reason I mention this is, that a friend of his came to me and requested that I would receive him, as he wished to move from where he was at present.[2] I was getting the house cleaned down and scoured, and I brought his friend in, and he saw the persons employed as I told him; he mentioned that it was not intended to remove him immediately, but said, "I think a week or ten days would answer." I assented, and indeed with reluctance: however, I made no mention of that. In a few days previous to Lord Edwards' coming, the government had offered one thousand pounds reward for his apprehension. I certainly felt very uneasy at this circumstance, and I wished very much to see Lord Edward's friend;

[1] That lady was Mrs. Moore, in whose husband's house Lord Edward had been previously concealed.

[2] The person alluded to was Surgeon Lawless.—R. R. M.

but where to see him I did not know. As a man of honour, I wished to keep my word, and I could not think of refusing him admittance when he came. Unfortunately for him and myself, I did keep my word. I expected him on Thursday, but he did not come till Friday, the 18th of May, 1798.[1] I perceived that he looked very bad, and altered from what he appeared when I saw him before. The lady who came with him did not stay long; and I made a tender of my services to go home with her, as she lived in the neighbourhood: there was a person that we met on our way, who I believe was waiting for her; I had some knowledge of him myself.[2] I returned to the house with a troubled mind. Lord Edward told me he was very ill with a cold, and it was easy to perceive it. I had procured for him whey, and put some sherry wine in it. At this time he appeared quite tranquil, and went up to the

1 Lord Edward had been previously concealed in his house for a fortnight, on his leaving the residence of the Widow Dillon, "a retired house on the banks of the canal," between Portobello and the Basin. When Murphy wrote this part of the narrative he was in prison, and evidently did not wish to run the risk of its being discovered that he had previously sheltered Lord Edward.

Mr. James Davock, a respectable silk merchant of the city of Dublin, informed me, a short time previously to his death in 1836, that he and two other persons conducted Lord Edward to Murphy's house the first time he was in concealment there; that about a fortnight before, he met Murphy at the Globe Coffee-house, and told him there was a friend of his who wished to be out of the way for a few days; that he did not mention Lord Edward's name, for Murphy was not an United Irishman; but as a personal favour to him, Davock, Murphy agreed to receive his friend; but subsequently, he told Murphy who the person was.

2 This person was probably Surgeon Lawless.—R. R. M.

room intended for him—the back room in the attic story. In the morning he came down to breakfast, and appeared better than the night before. The friend that spoke to me respecting his coming, came, I believe, about eleven o'clock. Then came out, for the first time, an account of the rencontre that took place the night before between Lord Edward's party and Major Sirr's.[1] It is perfectly clear, in my humble judgment, that Major Sirr had known of his removal, and the direction he intended to take, for his party and Lord Edward's came in contact in a place called Island Street, at the lower end of Watling Street. They there met, and a skirmish took place, and in the confusion Lord Edward got off: however, one of the party was taken, but could not be identified.[2] I found my situation now very painful, but nothing to what it was afterwards. In the course of the day (Saturday, 19th) there was a guard of soldiers, and, I believe, Major Swan, Major Sirr, a Mr. Medlicot, and another, making a search at Mr. Moore's house, the Yellow Lion, in Thomas Street.[3] A friend came and mentioned the circumstance to me. I immediately mentioned it to Lord Edward, and had him conveyed out of the house, and concealed in a valley on the roof of one of the warehouses. While I was doing this, Sam. Neilson came and inquired of the girl if I was at home. I believe she said not. "Bid him be cautious," I think was what she told me he said. I con-

[1] Sirr was accompanied by several persons, amongst whom were Major Ryan and Mr. John Swift Emerson, an attorney.

[2] William Putnam M'Cabe.—R. R. M.

[3] Moore had two houses in Thomas Street. The one in which Lord Edward was concealed was No. 119; the other was No. 124.

sidered that conduct of his very ill-timed: however, I am led to believe it was well intended. On Saturday morning, the day of the arrest, there came a single rap at the door; I opened it myself, and a woman with a bundle appeared, and inquired if that was Mr. Murphy's. I said it was. She informed me that she came from Mrs. Moore, and was directed to leave that bundle there. I knew not what it contained, but to my surprise, when I opened it, I found it to be an uniform, of a very beautiful green colour, gimpt or braided down the front, with crimson or rose-colour cuffs and cape:[1] there were two dresses—one a long-skirted coat, vest, and pantaloons; the other, a short jacket, that came round quite close, and was braided in front; there was also a pair of overalls, that buttoned from the hip to the ankle, with, I think, black Spanish leather on the sides. I suppose they were intended for riding. The bundle contained a cap of a very fanciful description, extremely attractive, formed exactly like a sugar-loaf—that part that went round the forehead green, the upper part crimson, with a large tassel, which inclined on one side or other occasionally when on the head.

After placing Lord Edward in the valley on the roof of the warehouse, I came down in a little time and stood at the gate, the soldiers still at Mr. Moore's. I perceived four persons walking in the middle of the street, some of them in uniform; I believe yeomen. I think Major Swan and Captain Medlicot[2] was of the

[1] The uniform eventually came into the possession of the Duke of York.

[2] Lieut. Thomas Medlicot of the City of Dublin Militia.—R. R. M.

party. Towards four o'clock Lord Edward came down to dinner; everything was supposed to be still. Now, at this time Sam. Neilson came in to see us. Dinner was nearly ready; I asked him to stay and dine, which he accepted. Nothing particular occurred, except speaking on a variety of subjects, when Mr. Neilson, as if something struck him, immediately went away, leaving us together. There was very little wine taken; Lord Edward was very abstemious. In a short time I went out; and now the tragedy commenced. I wished to leave Lord Edward to himself. I was absent I suppose about an hour. I came into the room where we dined, being the back drawing-room; he was not there; I went to the sleeping-room, he was in bed. It was at this time about seven o'clock. I asked him to come down to tea. I was not in the room three minutes, when in came Major Swan and a person following him in a soldier's jacket and a sword in his hand; he wore a round hat. When I saw Major Swan I was thunderstruck. I put myself before him, and asked his business. He looked over me, and saw Lord Edward in the bed. He pushed by me quickly, and Lord Edward seeing him, sprung up instantly like a tiger, and drew a dagger which he carried about him,[1] and wounded Major Swan slightly,

[1] The dagger with which Lord Edward defended himself in the last mortal struggle with his assailants, was not destined to remain one of the objects of *virtu* that collector of a refined taste for the arts, and of a strong passion for objects of curiosity (especially of articles in either of the precious metals), which, in latter years, ornamented the museum of the old man-hunter of the reign of terror in Ireland. It was given by the major to Lord Clare, and by the latter to a Mr. Brown, the owner of the house Murphy lived in in Thomas Street, and shortly afterwards was stolen from that gentleman.

I believe. Major Swan had a pistol in his waistcoat pocket, which he fired without effect; he immediately turned to me and gave me a severe thrust of the pistol under the eye, at the same time desiring the person that came in with him to take me into custody. I was immediately taken away to the yard; there I saw Major Sirr and about six soldiers of the Dumbarton Fencibles.

Major Swan had thought proper to run as fast as he could to the street, and I think he never looked behind him till he got out of danger, and he was then parading up and down the flags, exhibiting his linen, which was stained with blood.[1] Mr. Ryan supplied Major Swan's place; he came in contact with Lord Edward and was wounded seriously. Major Sirr at that time came up stairs, and keeping at a respectful distance, fired a pistol at Lord Edward in a very deliberate manner, and wounded him in the upper part of the shoulder. Reinforcements coming in, Lord Edward surrendered after a very hard struggle. Now the work of destruction commenced. The house was taken possession of by soldiers. An old invalid volunteered

In 1798 a cutler of Bridge Street, named Byrne, a Roman Catholic, and the only one of his creed belonging to that trade in Dublin, manufactured a species of stiletto, with a zigzag blade and a horn handle, for the leaders of the Dublin United Irishmen. There were few without them, and it was with one of these that Lord Edward Fitzgerald stabbed Major Ryan.—R. R. M.

[1] This part of the account of the struggle differs from Moore's. There is no mention there of Swan having quitted the room. Murphy, it will be observed, enters into no particular details of the struggle from the time he was removed in custody by Swan's orders. Further particulars on this subject will be found at the end of Murphy's narrative.

to guard me along with the man who first held me in charge. The old soldier would not let me put my handkerchief to my face to wipe away the blood. A neighbour came to offer me a glass of wine and water, but the valiant Major Sirr would not allow it. He was going to break the glass, saying wine was not fit for rebels. There were invalids at that time in James's Street, and they were soon brought down, and took possession of the house. I never had such a stock of wine before or since: I little thought who I bought it for. In some time a carriage came and I was placed in it, in company with two soldiers of the Dumbarton regiment, then stationed in Dublin, and brought off to the Castle, and there placed in the Castle guard-house. A sad change for me! I was there perhaps an hour or more, when my friend Major Sirr came to me to bring me into the presence of Mr. Cooke, taking me very friendly under the arm, and telling me to state everything I knew about the business. I felt no inclination to take his advice on that occasion.

Well! I had the honour of an introduction to Mr. Cooke. There was a gentleman lolling on the sofa, who I afterwards learned was Lord Castlereagh. My friend Cooke looked at me very sharply, and now for question and answer. "How long was Lord Edward in your house?" "He came there last night." "Who came with him?" "He came with a lady." "What was her name?" "I cannot state the lady's name." I declined to answer that *in toto*. I mentioned that I was led into the business very innocently, and that would appear on an investigation taking place, and I could procure sufficient bail. Mr. Cooke laughed at

that, and no wonder he might, for he immediately wrote out a Castlereagh warrant for me. I was walked back to the guard-house, and a large guard was ordered to prime and load, which was soon complied with. Then I was placed in the centre, and marched off to Newgate. This was about nine o'clock at night. On arriving there, I was left to ruminate on the situation I was unfortunately placed in. The only consolation I had was that there were very respectable men at the time in the same place with me. One friend offered me a part of his bed, which I accepted. I had a heavy heart, and slept but little. In the morning a messenger came to me to let me know I was wanting down stairs. One of the state prisoners in the room bid me to feign illness. I did not take his advice. I went down, and was brought "between hatches," as they called it, and for what purpose? Why, to be ironed! The mild Mr. Gregg was waiting for me. I spoke to him to allow me to send home for a pair of boots, as I wore shoes at this time. When I sent home I had neither boots nor shoes to get; however, there was a pound note sent to me. I must state that I was put in the felon side of the prison at that time. The note put Locket and Peachum in good humour, and I was then moved back to my old first lodging.

I have now to state the treatment I experienced from the soldiers and others that took possession of the house. Alderman Archer, who was one of the sheriffs at that time, but since dead, broke open my secretary and book-case, expecting, I suppose, to get as many papers of a treasonable nature as would convict a hundred, but was disappointed. Next he examined

the clothes-press, and then a general search commenced through the rooms; the office desk was broken open, but no papers to be found that could attach criminality. Plundering the place then commenced. Unfortunately, there was a company of invalids stationed in James Street; they were ordered down; they were known generally by the name of "Old fogies." Their wives came in great numbers, and immediately commenced robbing the place. A large silver gravy-spoon, a plated tea-pot, and plated goblet were taken —everything they could lay their hands on! They were quarrelling, I was informed, about the plunder; nothing in the house could escape their Argus eyes. An officer asked the men "if they found out the wine cellar?" It was soon forced. I never had such a stock before or since. They destroyed six dozen of as fine wine as could be found—claret, port, and sherry— I purchased it in the wood. The late Alderman Manders fortunately came in as a magistrate, and I believe did all he could, but it had no avail. I had a respected sister, a married lady, who came to the house and conducted herself nobly in the cause of her unfortunate brother, by doing all that was possible under such circumstances. The soldiers and "Old fogies" fell to at the wine. I had some pickled beef, and chickens in a coop; they were soon in requisition, and my new visitors regaling themselves, calling aloud to the servant, "You old—this and that—get us some porter": they wanted it with the beef and chickens. Fine times with them while it lasted! they never took the trouble of using a screw, but struck off the heads of the bottles with the next thing that came to hand. I have grounds

for stating that when they got tired drinking the wine, they were selling it in the morning at six pence per bottle, and buying whiskey with the money.

My losses in this unfortunate business amounted to upwards of two thousand pounds, and I never yet received one shilling of compensation from any quarter, and was confined fifty-five weeks a state prisoner, and my house and concerns made a barrack of for ten months and upwards, having ten soldiers—some with wives—besides invalids, and some of the Rea Fencibles, and the baggage of the regiment in the warehouses. Mr. Brown, the landlord, applied to Mr. Cooke at the Castle, to know if he would pay the rent, as he held the place, and he could not apply to Mr. Murphy for it? Mr. Cooke answered that he would pay no rent, so that when the government thought proper to liberate me, I was obliged to pay the rent and taxes while it remained a barrack—a severe case.

There is a circumstance I feel I wish to mention. There was an officer, an English gentleman, and he was ordered to my house with his party. He was a very short time in the city, and he mentioned to my next-door neighbour, on Sunday morning, the 20th of May, that a large party of men "of the lowest description, came on Saturday night to destroy the concerns, which he would not assent to," saying, "he heard the owner of the place was a man of good character," and "that it would make a very good barrack for himself and his men."

I have made an estimate of my losses, but not to the full extent.

I have to mention that Alderman Archer, then sher-

iff, came to me the day after my arrest, 20th of May, for my keys, to examine my papers, as he said, after breaking open my drawers the night before—a fine *ruse de guerre.*

Monday, 21st.—Two state prisoners brought in: Mr. Pat Byrne, Grafton Street, a bookseller; and Mr. J. G. Kennedy, a brewer.

Lord Edward Fitzgerald was confined in the most convenient room in the prison. No one was allowed to see him except the medical attendants. There was appointed to take care of him a Mr. Stone, I believe a lieutenant in the Londonderry regiment of militia, as he wore the uniform of that regiment, and great care he took of his charge. I could never get to see him myself, though I often wished it.

On the 23rd of May, Samuel Neilson was seen hovering in front of the prison. Simpson, the deputy jailor, I am told, beckoned to him with his hand to leave the place; however, Gregg arrested him, and brought him in "between the hatches," and ironed him, and then had him placed in the attic story of the felon side of the prison. Nothing could exceed the horror excited in the minds of the prisoners at the appearance of persons connected with the prison, as no person considered himself safe, from the line of conduct that appeared to be in contemplation. I shall give you a description of the discipline of this unfortunate place.

We should be in our rooms before nine o'clock, and were then locked up till eight o'clock in the morning. None were allowed to see us, only by order of the government. I endeavoured to reconcile myself to this

state of things, and the only consolation I had was that I was in company with gentlemen of respectability and honour. The jailor furnished us with a *table d'hote*, for which we paid twenty shillings English per week. In about two or three months, the state prisoners sent a memorial to the government to be put on state allowance, which was complied with, and we were allowed five shillings per day, which the jailor received, and gave us breakfast and dinner for it.

Two surgeons attended daily on Lord Edward Fitzgerald. It was supposed, the evening of the day before he died, he was delirious, as we could hear him, with a very strong voice, crying out: "Come on! come on! d——n you! come on!" He spoke so loud, that the people in the street gathered to listen to it. He died the next day, early in the morning, on the 4th of June. The surgeons attended and opened the body; then he was seen for the first time by the prisoners. The bowels were opened, and whatever was found there was thrown under the grate, and then the part opened was sewn up. He had about his neck a gold chain, suspending a locket with hair in it.

Thus died one of the bravest of men, from a conviction, I believe, that his projects would ameliorate the condition of his country. I shall endeavour to describe his person. He was, I believe, about five feet seven inches in height, and a very interesting countenance, beautiful arched eyebrows, fine grey eyes, handsome nose, and high forehead, thick, dark-coloured hair, brown, or inclining to black. I think he was very like the late Lady Louisa Connolly about the nose and eyes.

Any person he addressed must have admired his manner, it was so candid, so goodnatured, and so impregnated with good feeling; as playful and humble as a child, as mild and timid as a lady, and, when necessary, as brave as a lion. He was altogether a very fine, elegantly-formed man. Peace to his name! The lady that came with him to my house lived very near me. Her husband, Mr. Moore, was in some way implicated, and, I heard, a prisoner for some short time. His house was made a barracks as well as my own. I regret to state that, when he was liberated, he made interest to have the soldiers and luggage that were in his house removed to mine, and accompanied them himself. My revered father, since dead, was insulted by some of the party for attempting to remonstrate with them. I felt indignant at Moore's conduct when I heard it.[1]

I procured a copy of my committal, which I have by me as a memento, signed "Castlereagh;" also, a notice of trial served on me, in consequence of a special commission being issued, bearing date the 11th June, 1798, to be held at the Sessions House, Green Street. The notice is dated 25th day of May, signed "Thomas Kemmis, crown solicitor." I have the notice by me: there are upwards of sixty state prisoners embodied in it—the late Lord Edward Fitzgerald's name the first. The most serious part of the business was approaching to a crisis of the most deplorable description. The court was opened on Monday, the 11th June, 1798,

[1] Murphy's impressions on this subject were probably erroneous: he then had no means of ascertaining the truth of the stories he heard.—R. R. M.

and the first on trial were the Messrs. Henry and John Sheares. That great luminary, Counsellor Curran, was their leading advocate; and we could hear him addressing the jury at five o'clock in the morning, in our beds at Newgate. They were found guilty, and, after conviction, were brought into the prison. A dismal sight it was. They were ordered out at three o'clock the same day to receive sentence, and when that awful ceremony was performed, and they came in (they were ironed at this time), dreadful ideas entered every man's mind in this unfortunate place, to see these gentlemen in such a situation—the execution to take place next day! I cannot describe the feelings of the state prisoners.

The fatal day arrived. The Rev. Dr. Dobbin, a Protestant clergyman, attended them. A great number of yeomen and gentlemen came in of course. The prisoners were locked up. I am very sorry I did not procure the trials of these gentlemen and of the remainder; but it was not that I was thinking of at the time. Next ordered for his trial was Mr. John M'Cann —disposed of as the former! and never was a man more resigned; he met death as a brave man, and was quite disposed to meet his fate with firmness. Next trial, Mr. William Michael Byrne's, a very fine young man. I suppose his age about twenty-five years, and married only one year. Mrs. Byrne came to see him—a heart-rending meeting. Then followed Mr. Bond—and his conviction of course.

Words cannot now describe the feelings of the state prisoners: no chance of acquittal! an organized system! and the miscreant Reynolds the "*avant-garde*"

of it! I will not speak of the juries of 1798: I leave that for others to do.

At this time there was a Mr. Dobbs, a lawyer, and a Mr. Crawford, an attorney—two very good men. There was a proposition, I believe, came to the state prisoners through these gentlemen, I suppose sanctioned by the government, and that was—"That the state prisoners would give the government such information as they required, and for the state trials to terminate; the information not to criminate any person, and the prisoners to emigrate to a country not at war with his majesty." There was a document to be signed conformable to this agreement. There was not a moment to be lost, as Mr. William M. Byrne was to be executed this day, and Mr. O. Bond on the day following. All the state prisoners in our prison signed the contract, and myself among the rest. The privy council, early on that day, deliberated on the business, and the proposal was unfortunately rejected. In the course of the day, while it was pending, my revered and attached sister, hearing what I had done, came to the prison in tears, and asked me if I had done such a thing. I answered I had, and that I would go to any place to leave that abode of misery. "The business is now," I said, "before the privy council, and if Mr. Byrne is respited, which I hope he will, I will be satisfied to expatriate myself; but I will promise you, if it is to be done again, I will decline it." Well, the awful news came, that the council rejected the proposition; and Mr. Byrne was executed. He was an elegant young man, and went to death with as much composure as if he was going to dinner.

Well, the next day, the same business came on for Mr. Bond. I was now placed in a most unpleasant situation; but I was determined to keep my word. Mr. Dobbs, a good-hearted man, was most anxious for the prisoners; and the same business was again commenced. When it came to my turn to sign, I requested to say a few words: I said, that I was under great obligations to my family; that one of them came to me yesterday, in great trouble, in consequence of my signing the paper; and that I then promised that I would not sign it if it was to do again. However, I went to Mr. Bond myself, and stated to him how unhappy my family was at my signing, and the promise I made; but that if I was at my liberty and walking the street, I would sign for him if it served him. He very honourably left me to myself, and requested I would do nothing on his account, saying at the same time, "You know how you are situated." The document went a second time before the privy council. The greatest excitement that could be conceived existed at this time in the prison, to see Mr. Bond, an athletic, fine-formed man, who occupied the first class of respectability in Dublin, now heavily ironed! and what made it more lamentable was, to see Mrs. Bond with him, linked arm to arm. The coffin in the yard!—the dreadful apparatus ready! The sensation it excited could not be conceived. I cannot attempt to describe my own feelings at the time. Three o'clock came—no news from the Castle. Alternate hopes and fears crowded on the mind. At half-after three the news came—"A respite during pleasure!" The shout in the street was the first thing to announce it. There

was some person brought into the prison for shouting in the street. Joy was now visible in every countenance. A great change took place in the prison—the place was now comfortable to what it had been. The state trials now terminated, and the gentlemen who signed the agreement expected to go to America; but government decreed otherwise, for reasons best known to themselves. On the 6th of September, Mr. Bond died suddenly in Newgate: he was as well as ever he was on the evening before, and was playing rackets in the yard, to my knowledge. His apartment was quite detached from the rooms of the other prisoners, being convenient to the yard below stairs. Simpson, the under-jailor, Samuel Neilson, and himself, spent the evening in Mr. Bond's room. It was understood Samuel Neilson went to bed top-heavy, and left Simpson and Mr. Bond together. About eleven or twelve o'clock, Simpson came into the room I was in. Mr. Pat. Byrne, Mr. J. G. Kennedy, and myself were in this room. Simpson, I think, brought with him two bottles of wine (I was in bed at this time); they commenced drinking the wine. Mr. G. Kennedy got powerless, and went to bed as well as he could. Mr. Byrne, being a strong man, kept drinking with Simpson some time after. I was awake all this time, and perceived that Simpson wished to provoke a quarrel with Mr. Byrne: Mr. B. acted with great command of temper in the business, and with much ado Simpson went away. I then spoke to Mr. Byrne, and told him I heard all that passed, and that if he had in future any intercourse with Simpson, I would renounce his friendship, I was so enraged at what I heard. He

agreed with me in what I said. The next morning, about five o'clock, it went through the prison that Mr. Bond was dead. I immediately arose and went down stairs, and there to my astonishment saw Mr. Bond, lying on his back lifeless, with exactly the same dress he wore the day before. I came and informed Mr. Byrne and Mr. Kennedy of the fact. Samuel Neilson slept in the room that night, and could give no account whatever of what happened or how it happened. S. Neilson appeared very much affected, and cried like a child. There was a serious alarm in the prison, and great uneasiness among the prisoners, fearing there was foul play. Mr. Byrne arose in the bed, and mentioned with great emphasis: "Our lives are not worth an hour's purchase!" However, nothing came out that could establish that. As I was the only person who did not sign the "Banishment Bill," the government was endeavouring to have me brought to trial; and, for that purpose, the trusty Major Swan went to my house, that was a barrack for three months at that time, with a person (I suppose one of the "Battalion of Testimony") to look for pikes, desiring the person to go through the dormant window of the house, and if he found one, he would get half a guinea for it. A person who was in the house came to my brother with that word: it was well the fellow did not think of bringing one. However, nothing was found. When my brother heard of this, he went to the Castle and mentioned the circumstance, I believe to Mr. Cooke, and the answer he got was, "that there would be no more searching." Some of my family, endeavouring to procure my liberation, went once, or

twice, or thrice, to Lady Louisa Connolly, a very amiable character, to interest herself with Lady Castlereagh, and at one time she gave my sister a letter to that personage. My sister went to Lady Castlereagh's residence, expecting a favourable answer; and after waiting a considerable time—"Indeed," Lady Castlereagh said, "she could not interfere with Lord Castlereagh's affairs!" No hope in that quarter! Well, patience is a virtue, if we could but submit to it.

On the 18th March, 1799, the state prisoners were ordered to be in readiness to leave. Mr. Arthur O'Connor, while confined in Newgate, was not allowed out of his room; while there, he appeared dressed in a green coat, vest, and pantaloons, and half-boots. Mr. Dowling, Mr. Thomas Russell, Mr. Samuel Neilson, Mr. Dowdall, and Dr. M'Neven, I heard, came from the Castle. Our friend Major Swan, and his attendants, brought these gentlemen down to the quay, and they were put on board the "Anson Smith," government transport, and there joined the gentlemen sent from Kilmainham and Smithfield prisons. I understand that they were sixteen in number. On the 25th of March, they arrived in Belfast Lough, and took in five state prisoners there; on the 26th they sailed, and on the 30th they landed at Greenock. On the 9th April, they arrived at Fort George, the place of their destination; and in the year 1801 (in the spring of this year), peace being proclaimed, they were shortly after liberated.

N.B.—I take this from a newspaper, and I believe it to be perfectly correct.

I shall now state something respecting myself:—I

was arrested early in the unfortunate business, and kept prisoner in the yard of my house. First, I never saw Mr. Ryan, till I saw him coming down wounded: he was brought on something like a door. Secondly, my arrest took place before martial law took place. Thirdly, there were no papers of a treasonable nature found in the house; it was impossible there could be any, except they were put there by themselves. I will mention a circumstance here, and it is this:—the rooms were searched with great care; one of these feather-bed soldiers brought to Alderman Manders a dagger, which he said he found in one of the rooms. My sister appealed to Alderman Manders, and he honourably said there was no dagger there when he searched the room. Another of those plunderers wanted to know why my sister was not put out of the place. She replied boldly, "that she would not go"; that "it was her brother's house." I wish I could come in contact with the ruffian, for he must have a bad mind and a depraved heart. Fourth, the death of Lord Edward Fitzgerald taking place, of course there could be no bill of indictment framed against me, as there was no overt act to ground it on: I was indebted thus to Providence for my life, and I give God thanks for it! Still, there was no prospect of my liberation. There was a motion made in court by counsel, to admit me to bail, but it would not be allowed; so there I was, incarcerated inside the gloomy walls of a prison. However, I submitted with patience, though I found great difficulty in doing so. When I was first brought to this "chateau" (the jail), there was a Catholic clergyman attended and said Mass regularly on every Sunday,

and all the prisoners in the jail, who were Catholics, and others, might attend if they wished it. I understood the gentleman said Mass the first Sunday I was there. From that Sunday to the time of my liberation, which was upwards of a year, there was no Catholic clergyman allowed to officiate, but, in fact, was interdicted from coming to this abode of misery. The Rev. Mr. Gamble, a Protestant clergyman, a very good man, came sometimes on Sundays, and I feel pleasure in saying he conducted himself as a gentleman. I had a very high opinion of him from his conduct to my fellow-prisoners.

My family were doing all in their power to have me liberated, which was their anxious wish. There was a person spoken of, who it was supposed had interest in a certain quarter. There was an interview with this person, and he promised everything, and was to receive a stipulated sum for his trouble, which he got; and I believe he did nothing for it but fair promises, which I think he never realized. At length, after a severe confinement of fifty-five weeks, I was liberated and never brought to trial. The bail required was two sureties in £500 each, and myself in £1,000—the term seven years: all very moderate! Well, I was allowed to leave my (prison) mansion on the 10th June, 1799. When it was known I was at liberty, I had many friends coming to see me, of course, and I felt grateful for the kindness they expressed towards me. I went to my house, and found it in a deplorable condition:—the kitchen made a dirt-hole of by the soldiers; the parlour their kitchen; the rooms to answer any purpose they wished. I got the house and con-

cerns a mere shell—a house that I gave £250 fine for, subject to £70 yearly rent, and on which I expended £1,000 in useful improvements. I have now by me an estimate of my losses and the amount of what I paid for repairing the concerns, and it amounted to a very serious sum.

I was determined on an early day to have the pleasure of an introduction to the late Lady Louisa Connolly, and I went to Castletown for that purpose with my revered brother, now no more. I was announced by letter, and ordered to her presence. She had a very elegant and commanding figure, with a very expressive countenance, and with such good feeling and consideration as exhibited nobility itself.

Lady Louisa Connolly seemed to feel very much my situation; but stated very pathetically, "she could do nothing for me." Lady Sarah Napier being in the place, and hearing of me, sent the Hon. Miss Napier to me, requesting I would go to see her. I felt no hesitation in doing so, and complied. Lady S. Napier was a very nice personage, and we had some conversation on the unfortunate business, and she appeared to console me on the privations I was obliged to submit to. However, I took my leave, and it was easy to perceive what might be expected from my reception. I was then advised to address a letter to his Grace the Duke of Leinster, which I did, and waited on his grace at Leinster House. His grace allowed me the honour of an interview, and on seeing me he seemed to feel very much, and I thought I saw a troubled melancholy in his countenance; however, in our conversation, I clearly understood that his grace was not inclined

in any way to offer me the smallest pecuniary assistance, although I was spoken to by friends and recommended to apply. I then acted agreeably to their advice, and found it amounted to nothing. My friends were disappointed as well as myself.

I endeavoured to raise my trade with very limited means, and found it very difficult to do so. I felt now that great men were very easy about the misfortunes of others; and I am sorry I am obliged to make the remark. My case was one that was to be deplored in every point of view.

There is a note at the end of this statement, written by Murphy at a later period, and dated the 29th of November, 1831, repeating the circumstance of Bond's sudden death, the 16th of September, 1798, and the embarkation of the state prisoners the 18th of March 1799; their arrival at Fort George the 9th of April following, and their detention there till the spring of the year 1801, when they were liberated on peace being proclaimed.

As the note is a mere repetition of what is stated in the preceding narrative, it is unnecessary to insert it here.

In the latter years of his life the affairs of Nicholas Murphy were a good deal embarrassed. He was obliged to mortgage his house, and to borrow money from his sisters and brother. He died the latter end of April, 1833, in his 77th year, poor in circumstances, but with the char-

acter of an honest man, whose fidelity to Lord Edward Fitzgerald was the cause of his ruin. He was buried in the cemetery at Glasnevin. If he had played the villain with his friend, perhaps a monument might have been erected to his memory; as it is, there is not even a common headstone over his grave.

The sister of Nicholas Murphy died in poverty the latter end of 1843, in a miserable lodging at No. 47 Watling Street, in her 75th year. Shortly before her death, I drew up a memorial for her, addressed to the Duke of Leinster, appealing to his grace's charity, for some little assistance for the poor old lady, whose brother had been so cruelly used in purse and person for affording the shelter of his house and faithful services to his grace's uncle. That memorial was duly transmitted to the Duke of Leinster, but produced no effect. Murphy's sister ought to have remembered that Lord Edward Fitzgerald's memory, in the opinion of some of his race, ought to be buried in oblivion, and of some, even in obloquy. I cannot bring myself, however, to believe that the utmost moderation in politics, the tenderest consideration for the feelings of Major Sirr, the highest veneration for the names and virtues of the illustrious Camdens, Clares, and Castlereaghs, render it imperative on us to forget the memory of that man whose name and the story of whose life and death are written deep

in the heart's core of the people of this country. Those who think otherwise may not, perhaps, find it difficult to account for such matters as the following:—

Moore, in his "Diary," January 17, 1831, referring to his work, then in progress towards completion, thus refers to "a letter from the Duke of Leinster on the subject of my 'Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald,' written, as he says, at the request of Lady Campbell (the daughter of Lord Edward), to beg I would postpone the publication, and adding that he agrees with her as to the expediency of doing so." And a little later we find the following entry:—

"January 19, 1831.—Answered the Duke of Leinster, saying that I felt myself committed to the publication, nor could I agree with Lady Campbell nor his grace in their views of its postponement."[1]

Moore, in his "Diary," August, 1830, referring to his visit to Dublin, says he had some conversation with the Duke of Leinster about the intended "Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald." "While he was with me, Major Sirr left a card —such changes does times produce! Showed his card to the duke, who, I find, knows him, and thinks him, in his way, a good sort of man."

Moore subsequently saw the good sort of man

[1] "Moore's Memoirs."

who slew Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and he told Moore "he got the information as to the place where he (Lord Edward) was concealed but the moment before he acted on it. Ryan and Swan happened to be with him at the time; took five or six soldiers with him in plain clothes; when arrived in Thomas Street, sent for the pickets of cavalry and infantry in the neighbourhood; he had altogether between two and three hundred."

Moore states that the previous escape from arrest, when Lady Fitzgerald's papers were examined by Major Swan, was from Leinster House by the stables; and that it was after this Lady Fitzgerald took lodgings in Denzille Street.

Lord Edward, on being told by Surgeon Adrien that his wound in the shoulder was not dangerous, replied, "I am sorry for it." Being duly secured, searched, and deprived of some treasonable papers,[1] he was then removed in a sedan chair from Murphy's house to the Castle.

The number of wounds inflicted by Lord Edward on Swan and Ryan is said by Moore to have been almost incredible. Those inflicted on Swan, however, were not of a serious nature;

[1] One of the papers found on Lord Edward's person was a plan of attack on the city of Dublin, which had been drawn up and sent to him by that strange and incomprehensible man, Walter Cox.—R. R. M.

but those which Ryan received were found to leave no hope of recovery.[1]

The accounts given of the struggle of Lord Edward with his captors are exceedingly contradictory, and the official ones are not more exact than those which we find in the letters of members of Lord Edward's family. Murphy's account of the affair, so far as relates to what he witnessed, may be relied on as a true and authentic statement. The Duke of Portland, in a letter to a member of the Leinster family, communicating the capture of Lord Edward, states that, "Lord Edward, who was armed with a case of pistols and a dagger, stood on his defence, shot Mr. Ryan in the stomach, and wounded Mr. Swan with a dagger in two places. Major Sirr, on entering the room, and observing Lord Edward with the dagger uplifted in his hands, fired at him and wounded him in the arm of the hand

[1] Ryan was a nephew of the notorious Jack Giffard, *alias* "the dog in office," the proprietor of the "Dublin Journal." Ryan is described in some of the newspaper reports of Lord Edward's capture, as a printer. His son styles him editor of that paper. He appears to have been a kind of newspaper man of all work, of no regular appointed position on the press, but one of the nondescript class of employées of that old ascendency press of Ireland, all of whose people were expected, not only to do the work of getting out the paper, but to be imbued with its politics, and to promote them in private and in public by any means and in any capacity, *per fas aut nefas*. Mr. Ryan, like Polonius, had the absurdity to thrust himself into a most dangerous position, and he suffered the sad consequences of his folly, in being taken for his betters.

that held the weapon, upon which he was secured."

Lord Edward was armed solely with a dagger; he had not time or opportunity to get at his pistols when he was assailed by Swan in the first instance, and Ryan immediately after. Ryan was not shot; he was stabbed in the stomach, and received various wounds inflicted by the same weapon, in all fourteen. Swan received two slight wounds in the hand—finger-cuts, which alarmed him exceedingly.

Moore states the number of wounds inflicted by Lord Edward appears incredible. It will be seen in the following statements of Mr. D. F. Ryan, son of the Captain Ryan mortally wounded by Lord Edward Fitzgerald, which, I have no doubt, are quite correct, so far as respects the parts taken by Swan, Ryan, and Sirr, and the defence made by Lord Edward. The account of Mr. D. F. Ryan's narrative I will give in his own words: the opinions of the gentleman it is not necessary to trouble my readers with, though, "for the benefit of the present generation," he begs, to promise a few observations on the state of society in Ireland at the time of that rebellion. "For the benefit of the present generation," and in the fulness of my regard for its patience, and in consideration of its unlimited powers of endurance whenever it has to deal with such strictures as those of Mr. Ryan

on Thomas Moore, I leave his observations on the author of "Lord Edward Fitzgerald" in the dreary wilderness of the four great volumes of the "Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh," where I found them. But "for the benefit of the present generation," I cannot resist the temptation of citing one of Mr. Ryan's opinions with respect to the veracity of the son and historian of the Mr. Thomas Reynolds, of happy memory, who, to use a pious phrase applied by Major Sirr, in his latter days, when he was spiritual, on a similar occasion, I venture to hope, may reign "in a Heavenly mansion not made with hands."

Mr. D. F. Ryan, in reference to a letter published in the "Times" and "Standard" of January 9th, 1839, states, "that it was in refutation of a very false account that was contained in the life of the too notorious Thomas Reynolds." I am sure the public will duly appreciate the opinion of the grand-nephew of Mr. John Giffard, that Mr. Thomas Reynolds, senior, was "too notorious"; and if Mr. Ryan had added "to be trusted, even on his oath," I believe "the present generation" would have entirely concurred in that opinion of old Reynolds' morality. I have had a great deal of trouble imposed on me by the necessity occasioned by his biography to convict his historian of falsifying duly authenticated facts, of displaying audacious recklessness in a

sanctimonious, plausible, equivocating letter, addressed to me, in an attempted refutation of statements of mine in relation to his "too notorious" father. I therefore thankfully accept a testimony to my labours so corroborative of my sentiments in regard to the younger Reynolds's misstatements as that of Mr. D. F. Ryan wherein he asserts that the writer of the life of the too notorious Thomas Reynolds was capable of making very false statements.

Mr. D. F. Ryan states, his father had been an officer in the 103rd regiment, commanded by Sir Ralph Abercrombie, and on the reduction of that regiment, had settled in Dublin, and became editor of "Faulkner's Dublin Journal," of which his uncle, Captain Giffard, was proprietor; and being thus situated, he became a zealous loyalist: he raised the St. Sepulchre's corps, which he commanded. His death took place on the 30th of May, and his remains were interred on the 2nd of June, 1798, attended to St. Mary's Church, Dublin, by 1,500 gentlemen in uniform.

There can be no question that the unfortunate gentleman, who abandoned his functions as an editor of an Orange newspaper, or one of the staff of scribes and firebrands connected with it, for those of an amateur man-hunter, a rebel-catcher, on many occasions during the Irish Reign of Terror—on that last and most lamentable occasion displayed far more courage than

either of his associates, Town Major Sirr or Mr. Justice Swan, who were professionals in the man-hunting and rebel-catching line. I think few instances of fierce, persevering, desperate, tenacious, and determined courage in similar circumstances can be found, more remarkable than that instance of Ryan's prolonged struggle with such an adversary as Lord Edward Fitzgerald, mortally wounded as he was, and when felled to the ground by a deadly blow, still clinging fast to the legs of his powerful assailant. Swan's conduct in leaving for a moment his associate in such a position and such dreadful circumstances, faithfully related, as I believe the account of that struggle to be by Mr. D. F. Ryan, and confirmed, as I find it, in the most material points by Murphy's narrative, contrasts very unfavourably with the conduct of Ryan.

On the 19th of May, just four days before the intended insurrection, a Secretary of State's letter was directed to Town Majors Sirr and Swan and Captain Ryan, requiring them, with eight soldiers, to proceed to Thomas Street to arrest Lord Edward Fitzgerald. On reaching the house, Major Sirr and the soldiers remained below to defend the house against the mob, while Captain Ryan and Major Swan ascended the staircase. Major Swan first entered Lord Edward's apartment, and, on finding his lordship, cried out, "You are my prisoner;" upon which the latter aimed a blow with his dagger at Swan, who parried it with

his hand. The blade, after passing the fingers, glanced along the side, inflicting a superficial wound, of which he (Swan) recovered in about a fortnight. Swan, thus wounded, exclaimed, "Ryan, Ryan, I am basely murdered!" Captain Ryan, who had been searching another part of the house, on hearing this exclamation, immediately ran in, and seizing Lord Edward, threw him back on the bed, where a violent struggle ensued, in which Captain Ryan received an awful wound in the stomach. He instantly started up, and attempted to use a sword-cane. A most unequal contest followed, and lasted for about ten minutes, in the course of which Captain Ryan, unarmed, resolutely maintained his grasp of his prisoner, who, with desperate ferocity, inflicted wound after wound, to the number of fourteen. Captain Ryan's hands being disabled, he clung round Lord Edward with his legs, and, though dragged through the room towards the door, effectually prevented Lord Edward's escape to the staircase. All this time Lord Edward was unhurt, his opponent defenceless; nevertheless, he recklessly wounded, and brandished his awfully-constructed double-edged dagger, worn for the express purpose of carrying death to any assailant. This horrifying scene lasted until the arrival of the soldiers, and was terminated by Major Sirr discharging a pistol at Lord Edward: the ball entered his shoulder: but even then, so outrageous was he, that the military had to cross their muskets and force him down to the floor, before he could be overpowered and secured.[1]

1 "Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh, edited by his Brother."

The following letter, addressed to Mr. D. F. Ryan by Major Sirr, and by him published in the "Times" and "Standard" newspapers of the 9th January, 1839, and which was very generally copied by the press, will no doubt be read with interest:—

Dublin, December 29, 1838.

My Dear Ryan,—I received your letter referring to the account given in the "Times" newspaper of the taking of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and requesting to know whether I authorized that account as given.

I know not any thing how the occurrence took place in the room Lord Edward was discovered in; but on my arrival in view of Lord Edward, Ryan, and Swan, I beheld his lordship standing with a dagger in his hand, as if ready to plunge it into my friends, while dear Ryan, seated on the bottom step of the flight of the upper stairs, had Lord Edward grasped with both his arms by the legs or thighs, and Swan in a somewhat similar situation, both labouring under the torment of their wounds, when, without hesitation, I fired at Lord Edward's dagger arm, and the instrument of death fell to the ground. Having secured my titled prisoner, my first concern was for your dear father's safety. I viewed his intestines with grief and sorrow. I found a peaceful and hospitable habitation for him in a neighbouring house, Mr. Tighe's, and placed a guard over him for his protection. Swan was able to assist himself with the aid I afforded him, and I had him conveyed in a sedan-chair, which went in the procession with the prisoner, etc., to the Castle, and thence conveyed him to his residence.

Your dear father was a man of honour, and courageous, and often was a partner with me on dangerous and momentous occasions at that eventful period; and I trust he reigns in a Heavenly mansion not made with hands.

I have by me your father's sword-cane unsheathed, as I found it, which shall be yours, should you wish it.

I agree with you relative to Lord Edward: he was considered a highly honourable man at Gibraltar, where I knew him when he was on a visit to the governor of that garrison.

Remember me to your family in the kindest manner, and believe me, with sincerity and sincere regard, yours most truly,

HENRY CHARLES SIRR.

D. F. Ryan, Esq., excise officer, London.

The amateur rebel-catching services of Captain Ryan had been sufficiently rewarded, in the opinion of the Irish government, twenty years after the date of them; but it would appear that opinion was not shared by some members of the Ryan family.

On the 28th of August, 1819, Mr. Charles Grant, secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, writes to Mr. Secretary Hobhouse in respect to an application of Lieutenant Ryan, of 5th veteran battalion, made to Lord Sidmouth, representing the services of his family, and his present unhappy condition, and states, for Lord Sidmouth's information, that Mrs. Ryan, widow of

Daniel Frederick Ryan, who died of his wounds in 1798, had a pension from government, and her two daughters, for their lives, of £200 a year, "paid out of a private fund," and that his son, moreover, was first clerk of comptroller of taxes."

"His Excellency therefore thinks that the family of the late Mr. Ryan have been fully remunerated for the services they rendered."

"Signed, "C. Grant."[1]

[1] Private official correspondence, 1819.